The Opposite of Emptiness in the Middle Way Autonomy School

Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Great Exposition of the Middle*

Jongbok Yi

In collaboration with
Lo-sang-gyal-tshan

UMA INSTITUTE
FOR TIBETAN STUDIES

The Opposite of Emptiness in the Middle Way Autonomy School

Website for UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies (Union of the Modern and the Ancient: *gsar rnying zung `jug khang*): uma-tibet.org. UMA stands for "Union of the Modern and the Ancient" and means "Middle Way" in Tibetan. UMA is a non-profit 501(c)3 organization.

The Opposite of Emptiness in the Middle Way Autonomy School Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Great Exposition of the Middle*

Jongbok Yi

In collaboration with
Lo-sang-gyal-tshan

UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies
uma-tibet.org

Education in Compassion and Wisdom
UMA Go-mang Translation Project

Supported by a generous grant from the ING Foundation
and gifts from individual sponsors—
Hsu Shu-Hsun; Chou Mei-Dai;
Chien Jin-Hong; Pu Chih-Pin;
Daniel E. Perdue

Translating texts from the educational syllabus of the Go-mang College of Dre-pung Monastery. UMA stands for Union of the Modern and the Ancient (*gsar rnying zung 'jug khang*). The UMA Institute is a non-profit 501(c)3 organization.

UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies
7330 Harris Mountain Lane
Dyke, VA 22935-1008
USA

Version: September, 2014

ISBN 9781941381021

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014935828

Yi, Jongbok.
The opposite of emptiness in the middle way autonomy school: jam-yang-shay-pa's great exposition of the middle / by Jongbok Yi.
Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 9781941381021
1. 'Jam dbyangs bzhad pa ngag dbang brtson grus, 1648-1722. Dbu ma 'jug pa'i mtha' dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang 'jug ngogs. 2. Dge-lugs-pa (Sect)--Doctrines. 3. Dbu ma chen mo. 4. Wisdom—Religious aspects--Buddhism.
I. Lo-sang-gyal-tshan, 1966- II. Title.

Contents

Preface

This book provides an analyzed translation of part of Jam-yang-shay-pa Ngag-wang-tsön-drü's[a] *Decisive Analysis of the Middle,*[b] also called *Great Exposition of the Middle,*[c] which came to be the normative textbook for the study of Chandrakīrti's Middle Way treatise in the Go-mang College of Dre-pung Monastery. Specifically, translated here is the section on the object of negation in general and the object of negation in the Middle Way Autonomy School in the *Decisive Analysis of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'": Treasury of Scripture and Reasoning, Thoroughly Illuminating the Profound Meaning [of Emptiness], Entrance for the Fortunate*,[d] originally published in 1695. The author of this text, the Ge-lug polymath Jam-yang-shay-pa, is a prolific writer who composed the second set of monastic textbooks of Go-mang College.

In brief, the formation of monastic textbooks in Go-mang College can be divided into three phases. The first phase is the early growth of monastic education in Dre-pung Monastery and its subdivision, Go-mang College. Whether or not these units had set up formalized monastic curricula in the early 15th century C.E. is unclear. The second phase is comprised by the Old Monastic Textbooks[e] of Go-mang College which were formulated when the oral lectures of Gung-ru Chö-kyi-jung-ne[f] were turned into a formalized set of monastic textbooks in the early seventeenth century. Later, despite the destruction of his textbooks in Go-mang College and Ja-pü Monastery in Kham, they survived and were used until the advent of the New Monastic Textbooks by Jam-yang-shay-pa in the third phase in the very late seventeenth century, when they were replaced by his newly composed works.

---

[a] *'jam dbyangs bzhad pa ngag dbang brtson 'grus,* 1648-1721/1722.

[b] *dbu ma'i mtha' dpyod.*

[c] *dbu ma chen mo.*

[d] *dbu ma 'jug pa'i mtha' dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang 'jug ngogs.*

[e] *yig cha rnying pa.*

[f] *gung ru chos kyi 'jung gnas,* mid. 16th to early 17th centuries.

THE AUTHOR OF THE *GREAT EXPOSITION OF THE MIDDLE*

Jam-yang-shay-pa[a] was born in the Am-do Province of Tibet in 1648 east of the Blue Lake.[b] Having studied the alphabet at age seven with his uncle, who was a monk, he mastered reading and writing and six years later became a novice monk. He went to Lhasa at age twenty-one to further his studies at the Go-mang College of Dre-pung Monastery; six years later he received full ordination and at twenty-nine entered the Tantric College of Lower Lhasa. From age thirty-three he spent two years in meditative retreat in a cave near Dre-pung Monastery. Perhaps it was at this time that Mañjushrī, also called Mañjughoṣha, appeared to him and smiled, due to which, according to Ngag-wang-leg-dan,[c] he came to be called "One On Whom Mañjushrī (Jam-yang) Smiled (shay-pa)."

At age fifty-three he became abbot of Go-mang and at sixty-two in 1710 returned to Am-do Province where he founded a highly influential monastery at Tra-shi-khyil.[d] Seven years later he founded a tantric college at the same place. He wrote prolifically on the full range of topics of a typical Tibetan polymath and, having received honors from the central Tibetan government and from the Chinese Emperor, died at the age of seventy-three or seventy-four in 1721/2.

Partly because of the close connection between Go-mang College and the Mongolian peoples stretching from the Caspian Sea through Siberia, who were predominantly Ge-lug-pa by this time, Jam-yang-shay-pa's influence on the Ge-lug-pa order has been considerable. His life manifests a pattern typical of many influential Tibetan religious figures—child prodigy, learned scholar, disseminator of the religion, politician, priest to political personages, monastery leader, yogi, magician, popular teacher, and prolific writer.

---

[a] This short biography is taken from Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound,* 14-15. For a longer biography see Derek F. Maher, "Knowledge and Authority in Tibetan Middle Way Schools of Buddhism: A Study of the Gelukba (*dge lugs pa*) Epistemology of Jamyang Shayba (*'jam dbyangs bzhad pa*) In Its Historical Context" (Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 2003), 169-196.

[b] *mtsho sngon.*

[c] *mkhan zur ngag dbang legs ldan,* 1900-1971; abbot emeritus of the Tantric College of Lower Lhasa and ge-she of Go-mang College; a Tibetan born in Yag-day (*g.yag sde*) on the border between the central and western provinces of Tibet but included in Tsang (*gtsang*), he is not to be confused with the Mongolian *ngag dbang legs ldan.*

[d] *bkra shis 'khyil.*

TOPICS OF THE BOOK

Regarding the principal topic of this book, the object of negation[a] in the view of emptiness according to the Middle Way School and especially its subdivision, the Autonomy School, Tsong-kha-pa Lo-sang-drag-pa,[b] the founder of the Ge-lug tradition, puts great emphasis on the identification of object of negation—that is to say, what is rejected in the view of emptiness—since, according to him, without clearly identifying what veils suchness (or emptiness) one cannot achieve the view of emptiness:[c]

> With regard to delineating the absence of true existence in phenomena, if you do not understand well just what true establishment is, as well as how [phenomena] are apprehended as truly existent, the view of suchness will definitely go astray.

Moreover, the Ge-lug-pa presentation of the understanding of the object of negation in the Autonomy School is an important feature providing crucial justification for the division of the Middle Way School into the two subschools of the Autonomy School and the Consequence School. In the present work, Jam-yang-shay-pa defends and refines Tsong-kha-pa's position on the object of negation, and also clarifies objections from scholars on particular points within the Ge-lug-pa tradition as well as from other traditions of Tibetan Buddhism.

This translation of Jam-yang-shay-pa's text utilizes the UMA Debate Analysis Method, colorizing the author's positions in blue and what he considers incorrect positions in red to help readers easily understand the content of debates. In this way I have reformatted Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Decisive Analysis* *of the Middle* to clearly highlight the three fundamental aspects of Tibetan literary debate: a refutation of the philosophical positions of others with which the author does not agree ("Refuting Other Systems"), a constructive presentation of his own philosophical positions ("Our Own System"), and a refutation of potential objections that others might raise to his own philosophical positions ("Dispelling Objections to Our Own Position").

Jam-yang-shay-pa's presentation not only functions as an authoritive monastic text providing debate skills and strategy, but also is as an arena where historical figures criticize each other through virtual debates

---

[a] *dgag bya, pratiṣedhya.*

[b] *tsong kha pa blo bzang grags pa,* 1357-1419.

[c] Translated by Jeffrey Hopkins, *Tsong-kha-pa's Final Exposition of Wisdom,* ed. by Kevin Vose (Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Publications, 2008), 186.

conducted in a formalized style, thereby making arguments promoting specific philosophical points.

General Section on the Object of Negation

The first part translated here is Jam-yang-shay-pa's general section on what is refuted in the doctrine of emptiness in the Middle Way School. It consists of nine refutations in the subsection on Refuting Other Systems and two debates in the subsection on Dispelling Objections. As I show in list form below, analysis indicates that Jam-yang-shay-pa indirectly presents 71 points in Refuting Other Systems and 9 points in Dispelling Objections, whereas the number of points that he presents in the subsection on Our Own System is remarkably small, only 14. Thus, all three sections need to be gleaned to understand the philosophical structure being presented about the object of negation.

In addition to this discrepancy in numbers, there is also a difference in format. Philosophical points are only indirectly presented in Refuting Other Systems and Dispelling Objections, since they are embedded in debate dialogs, requiring ferretting out the author's own position usually by extrapolating the opposite of the notion being voiced, while the part presenting Our Own System consists of direct presentation of philosophical positions written in expository prose. As presented below, these points:

1. justify the necessity of identifying the object of negation
2. introduce the two different ways of discerning the two types of objects of negation
3. provide the criteria and subdivisions of the objects to be negated by correct reasonings
4. clarify easily confused logical terms.

When we compare these philosophical points on the identification of object of negation in this way, the difference between indirect and direct presentations is obvious. This characteristic of the genre of Decisive Analysis[a] within monastic textbook literature contrasts sharply with the style of other Tibetan scholastic thinking, which focuses on expository prose to provide detail on philosophical systems. The style of Decisive Analysis has a twofold explicit pedagogical function and goal indicated clearly in its usage of actual debate format—it teaches monastics how to debate, and

---

[a] *mtha' dpyod.* The meaning of *mtha' dpyad pa* is variously described as analyzing the limits of entailment (*khyab mtha' dpyad pa*), "final analysis" (*mtha' dpyad pa*), and "decisive analysis" (*mtha' gcad pa*).

it also massively communicates specific philosophical points.

In this way, Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Decisive Analysis of the Middle* aims to teach skills and strategies for actual debate practice in the debate courtyard while educating students about crucial philosophical points in the process. Whereas the "Our Own System" section may be relatively modest in extent, when looked at as a whole, all three sections—and their 94 points—are tightly marshaled to argue for specific philosophical positions, all along teaching students how one goes about debating them. (See the chart on the next page.)

	Detailing the 71 individual points in Refuting Other Systems, the 14 points in Our Own System, and the 9 points in Dispelling Objections to Our Own Position (the beginning of each debate is in bold)
	JAM-YANG-SHAY-PA'S 71 POINTS IN REFUTING OTHER SYSTEMS
1	***First Debate*** **If one has not identified the object of negation, the non-dawning of any object to one's awareness and not thinking anything is not to see, not to realize the mode of subsistence.**
2	It cannot be claimed that the mere non-dawning of all the stable and the moving, that is to say, the inanimate and the animate, to your mind is the meaning of seeing the mode of subsistence of those objects because it is not that you realize the mode of subsistence of all the stable and the moving in worldly realms that you yourself do not know.
3	Aspects of all the stable and the moving in worldly realms do not dawn to your awareness.
4	The non-dawning of those is not the meaning of seeing the mode of subsistence of these objects.
5	Whatever is a non-view ignorance (*lta min gyi ma rig pa*) necessarily does not realize emptiness!
6	When the aspect of emptiness dawns to an awareness, the aspect of the negative of its object of negation dawns.
7	The non-dawning of anything to an awareness is not a realization of emptiness.
8	When the aspect of emptiness dawns, the factor that is a negative of the object of negation—true establishment—dawns.
9	Emptiness is a non-affirming negative that is a negative of true establishment.
10	Since emptiness is a non-affirming negative that is a negative of true establishment, the factor that is the negative of the object of negation—true establishment—must dawn when the aspect of emptiness dawns.
11	When meaning-generalities of non-affirming negatives dawn in dependence upon explicitly refuting their objects of negation, it is necessary that another phenomenon is not projected explicitly or implicitly.

12	Without the meaning-generality of the object of negation previously dawning to an awareness, the nonexistence that is the negative of it cannot dawn to an awareness.
13	With regard to realization of emptiness, both (1) the non-dawning of appearances of coarse conventionalities and (2) a dawning of an aspect—that is, a generic image—of the naturelessness of those objects are necessary. Buddhapālita asserts that for realization of the emptiness of former and future births, a dawning of an image of the naturelessness of those is necessary; and the Chandrakīrti also asserts such.
14	The Nihilists and the Proponents of the Middle Way are very different due to the fact that the Nihilists' see the mere non-appearance of those objects from the power of ignorance whereas the Proponents of the Middle Way see phenomena as not inherently produced and so forth by reason of the nonexistence of the inherent nature of all phenomena.
15	The measure of realizing the view is realization that future lives and so forth do not truly exist because of being empty of inherent existence due to being dependent-arisings.
16	***Second Debate*** **Without knowing the details with regard to conventions, one cannot realize emptiness.**
17	Conventions have to be validly established.
18	The ultimate is other than conventionalities.
19	Without knowing how to posit the valid establishment of conventions it is impossible to realize naturelessness.
20	***Third Debate*** **Without knowing how to posit valid establishment, it cannot be posited that emptiness is realized through holding that phenomena are natureless.**
21	Without knowing how to posit valid establishment, it cannot be posited that the emptiness of former and later births is realized through holding that former and later births are natureless.
22	The Diverged Afars', that is, Nihilists', holding former and later births as natureless, for example, is not a view of emptiness.

23	The reasons why this view of the Diverged Afars is a view of annihilation but the Middle Way Proponents' holding former and later births as natureless is a pure view are respectively due to the Diverged Afars' not asserting but the Middle Way Proponents' asserting establishment in conventional terms.
24	The Diverged Afars' holding that former and later births are natureless is a view of annihilation.
25	The Diverged Afars do not realize naturelessness as the Proponents of the Middle Way do within knowing how to posit the valid establishment of conventionalities.
26	The Middle Way view and mode of holding that former and later births are natureless do not accord with those of the Diverged Afars.
27	Both the Diverged Afars and the Proponents of the Middle Way hold that former and later births are natureless.
28	Although the Diverged Afars and the Proponents of the Middle Way are similar in holding that the objects, former and later births, are natureless, whether it is the Middle Way view or not is posited separately due to differences in the inner modes of the realizers' awarenesses.
29	For example, when both someone who identified a man as a robber and another who did not identify such say, "He is the robber," it is posited that the one who knew the robber identified the robber and that the other one did not identify the robber.
30	Buddhapālita says, "Likewise, although it is a fact that all phenomena are empty and because of being empty are not produced and not ceased, those (the Proponents of the Middle Way) who have knowledge by direct perception of it (that is, emptiness,) are endowed with goodness and are praised, but because the others (the Diverged Afars) do not directly (see) emptiness, they are polluted by the defects of view and derided by the wise."
31	***Fourth Debate*** **The view in the Diverged Afars mental continuum that former and later births are natureless is not the Middle Way view.**
32	The naturelessness of former and later births is the final mode of subsistence.
33	The view in the mental continuum of Proponents of the Great Exposition that a Buddha's enjoyment body is natureless is not the Middle Way view.

34	The naturelessness of an enjoyment body is the final mode of subsistence.
35	Likewise, know how to apply this mode of refutation to the Mind-Only Proponents' view that the imputational nature is not established by way of its own character.
36	***Fifth Debate*** **Such a view in the Diverged Afars' continuum that former and later births are natureless is not a factually concordant conceptual consciousness.**
37	The view in the continuum of a Proponent of the Great Exposition that a Buddha's enjoyment body is natureless is not a factually concordant conceptual consciousness.
38	***Sixth Debate*** **The statement by Tsong-kha-pa:** **When, in that way, you have identified well the apprehension of true existence, you will understand that there are many apprehensions that are not the two apprehensions of self, whereby all wrong ideas asserting that reasonings analyzing suchness refute all objects apprehended by conceptuality will be overcome.** **is logically feasible.**
39	The thought of the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras is not to be explained as being that howsoever forms are apprehended—as the four extremes of being empty or not empty or as the middle free from them—are apprehensions of extremes and hence have to be refuted.
40	Tsong-kha-pa, having solely refuted truth, that is, true establishment (*bden par grub pa*), asserts that forms abide in the middle.
41	The distinction should be made that reasoning analyzing the ultimate refutes inherent existence but does not refute forms and so forth that are illusory-like dependent-arisings.
42	Reasoning does not refute all whatsoever objects.
42	Go-ram-pa contradicts many sūtras and treatises such as Chandrakīrti's *Clear Words* which says: We are not propounding that "Action, doer, effect, and so forth do not exist." Why? We posit that inherent existence does not exist.

43	***Seventh Debate*** **Refutation of objects imputed only by Forders and Proponents of Tenets does not harm the apprehension of inherent existence that has operated beginninglessly.**
44	Even among innate awarenesses there are apprehensions of permanence and of former and later phenomena as one.
45	There is something eliminated by "only" in the statement that refutation of objects imputed *only* by Forders and Proponents of Tenets does not harm the apprehension of inherent existence that has operated beginninglessly: namely, what is misapprehended by innate misapprehensions.
46	Whatever is an apprehension of permanence is not necessarily an apprehension in accordance with the Forders' superimposition that the self is permanent.
47	An innate apprehension of permanence does not apprehend in that way, that is to say, in accordance with the Forders' superimposition that the self is permanent.
48	In the continuums of those who are not involved in tenet systems such as animals and so forth, there is no apprehension that the self is permanent in the sense of not being produced from causes and conditions.
49	In the continuums of those who are not involved in tenet systems such as animals and so forth, there is apprehension that the self is permanent in the sense of not disintegrating until death.
50	Since the Proponents of the Great Exposition, the Proponents of Sūtra, and so forth have not entered the Middle Way view, they cannot harm the conceived object of the apprehension of true existence.
51	The thesis that Tsong-kha-pa's statement—"Refutation of objects imputed only by Forders and Proponents of Tenets does not harm the apprehension of inherent existence that has operated beginninglessly"—is not logically feasible is not logically feasible.
52	***Eighth Debate*** **There are two objects of negation by correct reasoning: existent and nonexistent.**
53	Object of negation by a correct reasoning and object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum of a correct sign are not equivalent.

54	The apprehension of true existence is an object of negation by a correct reasoning.
55	The apprehension of true existence is not an object of negation by a correct sign proving the absence of true existence.
56	The apprehension of true existence is not a probandum of a correct sign.
57	The apprehension of true existence is an object of negation by a correct reasoning proving something as not truly existent.
58	Reasoning (*rigs pa*) and logicality (*'thad pa*) are equivalent.
59	Both an apprehension of true existence as well as its conceived object—that is, true establishment—must be posited as objects of negation by a correct reasoning, which is also called a correct logicality.
60	Since the apprehension of true existence is not logically feasible in accordance with its apprehension, the apprehension of true existence comes to be an object of negation by a correct logicality.
61	The apprehension of true existence is existent.
62	You cannot negate by means of a correct sign something that exists.
63	The predicate of the probandum in a proof of something is not to be confused with the probandum in the proof of that something since a probandum has both a subject and a predicate.
64	***Ninth Debate*** **The object of negation that is the opposite of a probandum of a correct sign necessarily does not exist.**
65	Nonexistence of sprout is not the object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum of a correct sign proving that a sprout exists.
66	That a sprout exists is the probandum in the proof that a sprout exists.
67	That that a sprout exists is the probandum in the proof that a sprout exists does not entail that the nonexistence of a sprout is the object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum of a correct sign proving that a sprout exists.
68	That a sprout is nonexistent is posited as the opposite of the probandum in the proof that a sprout exists.
69	Existence of self is not the object of negation of the probandum in the proof that the aggregates are selfless by the sign, dependent-arising.

70	Your mode of assertion with regard to a sprout—that is, that the nonexistence of sprout is the object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum of a correct sign proving that a sprout exists—is not logically feasible.
71	It is not reasonable to refute even the substratum.

JAM-YANG-SHAY-PA'S 14 POINTS IN OUR OWN SYSTEM

1	In order to ascertain emptiness it is necessary initially to identify the object of negation because if the object of negation is not identified, the emptiness that negates the object of negation is not identified.
2	In general, there are two types of objects of negation: objects of negation by the path and objects of negation by reasoning.
3	Among them, within the objects of negation by the path, there must be an existent because if there is not an existent object of negation by the path, all sentient beings would be self-released, and the hardship of practicing the path would be meaningless.
4	With respect to objects of negation by correct reasoning, two types are taken as objects of negation—wrong apprehensions and the objects apprehended by them
5	It is like, for example, the fact that with regard to objects of negation by the reasoning of dependence, both (1) the apprehension of a thing as not depending on causes and conditions and (2) its object, that is, a thing's not depending on causes and conditions, are not logically feasible and not reasonable, and therefore they are taken as objects of negation.
6	Although there are four types of correct reasoning—the reasonings of dependence, of logicality, of the performance of function, and of nature—when summarized, they are included within two types, because these four are included into the reasoning analyzing the ultimate and the reasoning analyzing conventions.
7	Logically feasible (*'thad pa*), suitable (*rung ba*), and reasonable (*rigs pa*) are equivalent because Vasubandhu's *Principles of Explanation* (*rnam bshad pa'i rigs pa*, *vyākyāyukti*) says such.
8	The *rigs pa* of *'thad rigs* (*'thad pa dang rigs pa,* logicality and reasoning) and the *rig pa* of *blo rig* (*blo dang rig pa,* awareness and knowledge) are not equivalent.

9	In Tibetan the presence and absence of the suffix *sa* in *rigs pa* and *rig pa* differ, and in Sanskrit the terms also differ since *yoṣir*[a] is used for the *rigs pa* of *'thad rigs* (logicality and reasoning) and *vidyā* is used for the *rig pa* of *blo rig* (awareness and knowledge).
10	The opposite of logicality is taken as the object of negation by reasoning.
11	When comparing the high speech (*gsung rab*, *pravacana*) of Tsong-kha-pa and his spiritual sons Khay-drub and Gyal-tshab, it turns out that the four non-reasonables (non-reasonable with regard to dependence, non-reasonable with regard to logicality, non-reasonable with regard to the performance of function, and non-reasonable with regard to nature) which are the opposites of the four reasonings (the reasoning of dependence, of logicality, of the performance of function, and of nature) are taken as objects of negation.
12	Correct reasoning (*rigs pa yang dag*) and correct sign (*rtags yang dag*) are not equivalent.
13	Because the objects of negation by a correct reasoning and a correct sign are not equivalent, correct reasoning (*rigs pa yang dag*) and correct sign (*rtags yang dag*) are not equivalent, and the objects of negation by a correct reasoning and a correct sign are also not equivalent.
14	In accordance with statements by the lords of scholars Gung-ru Chö-kyi-jung-nay and Tag-lung-drag-pa Lo-drö-gya-tsho, the objects of negation by correct signs are nonexistents because there are manifold scriptures and reasonings.

JAM-YANG-SHAY-PA'S 9 POINTS IN DISPELLING OBJECTIONS

1	***Tenth Debate*** **The apprehension of something as truly existent by an apprehension of true existence is not logically feasible.**

[a] The two editions of *dbu ma'i mtha' dpyod* read *yoṣir*. See 'jam dbyangs bzhad pa, *dbu ma 'jug pa'i mtha' dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal gyi dkar chag* in the *Collected Works of 'Jam-dbyangs-bzhad-pa'i-rdo-rje: Reproduced from prints from Bkra-shis-'khyil Blocks*, vol. 9 (South India, India: s.n., 1995). 186a.3; 'jam dbyangs bzhad pa, *dbu ma 'jug pa'i mtha' dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod* (Beijing, China: pe cin nyug hran shin 'gyig par khang, 2004). 190.3. I was not able to find the corresponding Sanskrit term for *yoṣir*. It might be *yukti*.

2	The apprehension of something as truly existent by a consciousness apprehending true existence is an object of negation by a correct reasoning; however, it is not that the apprehension of something as truly existent by a consciousness apprehending true existence does not exist.
3	The apprehending of something as truly existent by a consciousness apprehending true existence is not logically feasible, but the apprehension of something as truly existent by a consciousness apprehending true existence does exist.
4	The Outsiders' reasonings proving the existence of a self of persons and their modes of explanation each exist.
5	The Outsiders' reasonings proving the existence of a self of persons and their modes of explanations are not logically feasible.
6	***Eleventh Debate*** **The apprehension of true existence is not an object of negation by a sign analyzing the ultimate.**
7	The apprehension of true existence is an object of negation by an inference that is a rational consciousness analyzing the ultimate.
8	There is utterly no entailment that whatever is an object of negation by an inference that is a rational consciousness analyzing the ultimate is necessarily an object of negation by a sign analyzing the ultimate.
9	The wisdom realizing the absence of true existence is not a probandum of a correct sign proving the absence of true existence.

As can be seen from the table, students learn from the two sections on Refuting Other Systems and Dispelling Objections many more of Jam-yang-shay-pa's positions than are in the presentation of his own system.

This layout has the virtue of disentangling these components from the complex back and forth of the original text. Having done so, not only can we clearly see what those points are, but we can also appreciate the relative extent of each of the three components, thereby glimpsing what such debate texts strive to accomplish—expertise in the method of debate within acquisition of philosophical points, and, perhaps above all, an increased capacity to think logically.

The Object of Negation in the Autonomy School

The second part Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Decisive Analysis of the Middle* translated in this book concerns the object of negation in the Middle Way Autonomy School. This also is divided into three sections—Refuting Others' Mistakes, Presenting Our Own System, and Dispelling Objections to Our Own System.

Refuting others' mistakes about the object of negation in the Autonomy School

The sixteen refutations of others' mistakes center around four topics:

1. explaining and defending Tsong-kha-pa's identification of the innate apprehension of true existence
2. analyzing whether true existence appears to sense consciousnesses according to the Autonomy School
3. determining the meaning of "merely imputed by conceptuality" (*rtog pas btags tsam*) and "only imputed by names" (*ming gis btags tsam*) according to the Autonomy School
4. examining abstruse and central points regarding the reasoning of the lack of being one and many, the favorite reasoning of the Autonomy School.

1. Explaining and defending Tsong-kha-pa's identification of the innate apprehension of true existence (debates 1-4)

In the main part of this section, Jam-yang-shay-pa explains that Tsong-kha-pa's identification of the innate apprehension of true existence stems from the statement in the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras that all phenomena, including emptinesses, only conventionally exist and his extrapolation of true existence or ultimate existence as the opposite of that. Since the emptiness of form, for instance, is realized by an analytical consciousness searching for form, this analytical consciousness[a] cannot be the "ultimate" in the term "ultimately exist" when the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras say that form does not ultimately exist. For, because the emptiness of form

[a] Also called a "rational consciousness" or "reasoning consciousness."

does exist in the face of, or in the perspective of, such an analytical consciousness, the emptiness of form would absurdly ultimately exist. Tsong-kha-pa concludes that, rather than this, "ultimate" in the term "ultimately exist" when the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras say that "form does not ultimately exist," must mean something else.

Tsong-kha-pa admits that when Proponents of the Middle Way Autonomy School debate about true existence or ultimate existence, they mostly debate about the former sort of ultimate, but he calls this the ultimate existence, or true existence, in terms of the intellectually imbued apprehension of ultimate existence, or true existence, and declares that it is not the ultimate or true existence in terms of the innate apprehension of ultimate true existence simply because it cannot fit the description in the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras. The problem is to find such a description in the literature of an Indian Proponent of the Middle Way Autonomy School. Tsong-kha-pa finds such a statement in Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle* which, through considerable creative adjustment, he turns into just what is needed. In brief, these modifications allow Tsong-kha-pa to hold that in this context:

- ultimate means "its own uncommon mode of abiding without being posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness" (*blo gnod med la snang ba'i dbang gis bzhag pa ma yin par rang gi mthun mong ma yin pa'i sdod lugs*), and
- ultimately established means "established by way of its own uncommon mode of abiding without being posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness" (*blo gnod med la snang ba'i dbang gis bzhag pa ma yin par rang gi mthun mong ma yin pa'i sdod lugs kyi ngos nas grub pa*).

Tsong-kha-pa is adamant that Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle* is the *only* clear text in the Autonomy School to identify the object of negation in terms of the innate apprehension of true existence. However, following Tsong-kha-pa's pattern of research, two of his followers take issue with his claim that Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle* is the only Autonomy text to identify the object of negation in terms of the innate apprehension of true existence. Specifically, Jay-tsün Chö-kyi-gyal-tshan[a] of the Jay College of Se-ra Monastery and Gung-ru Chö-jung, the author of the old textbooks of Go-mang College, claim to have another such identification, this being two lines in Jñānagarbha's *Differentiation of the Two Truths*.

[a] *rje btsun chos kyi rgyal mtshan,* 1469-1544/1546.

Jay-tsün Chö-kyi-gyal-tshan says that these lines *very clearly* identify the innate apprehension of true existence, while Gung-ru Chö-jung asserts that it *explicitly* identifies it, the latter perhaps avoiding the word "clearly" to pretend not to contradict Tsong-kha-pa. Jam-yang-shay-pa, while mentioning neither by name, cogently refutes them by referring to the preceding six lines in Jñānagarbha's text itself that undeniably reveal that he is speaking about the two truths, conventional and ultimate, and hence not about conventional and ultimate establishment. Jam-yang-shay-pa then backs this up with references to Jñānagarbha's *Auto-commentary* and Shāntarakṣhita's *Commentarial Explanation of (Jñānagarbha's) "Differentiation of the Two Truths."* It is easy to conclude that Jam-yang-shay-pa, by finding this mistake in Jay-tsün Chö-kyi-gyal-tshan's and Gung-ru Chö-jung's expositions, cogently defends Tsong-kha-pa's position on the object of negation in terms of innate apprehension of true existence.

2. Analyzing whether true existence appears to sense consciousnesses according to the Autonomy School (debate 5)

Given that Tsong-kha-pa says:

> Jñānagarbha's *Autocommentary on "Differentiation of the Two Truths"* explains that true [existence]—the object of negation—does not appear to sense consciousnesses, and it is the same here [in Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle*].

it is astounding that Jam-yang-shay-pa, contrary to all the other major Gelug-pa textbook authors, holds that true establishment in terms of an innate apprehension of true establishment appears to sense consciousnesses. He explains Tsong-kha-pa's statement away as meaning that true establishment in terms of an intellectually imbued apprehension of true establishment does not appear to sense consciousnesses. This is a highly creative, critical, and provocative move on Jam-yang-shay-pa's part, given that if Tsong-kha-pa meant to say this, he had plenty of opportunity to do so but did not. Nevertheless, Jam-yang-shay-pa's re-reading fits in with Tsong-kha-pa's positions that in the Mind-Only School and in the Consequence School the object of negation appears to sense consciousnesses.

3. Determining the meaning of "merely imputed by conceptuality" (rtog pas btags tsam) and "only imputed by names" (ming gis btags tsam) according to the Autonomy School (debates 6-8)

In brief, once Autonomists assert that all phenomena are established from their own side, phenomena cannot be merely imputed by conceptuality. Unlike the Proponents of Mind-Only, the Autonomists assert that the term "only (*tsam*)" in "only imputed by names" (*ming gis btags tsam*) eliminates the two, "own-character" and "establishment from its own side."

4. Examining abstruse and central points regarding the reasoning of the lack of being one and many (debates 9-16)

Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Decisive Analysis of the Middle* does not give a general introduction to the reasoning of the lack of being one or many and, instead, jumps right into a series of sometimes peripheral and sometimes central points concerning the reasoning. Therefore, let us turn to Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Great Exposition of Tenets,*[a] published in 1699 four years after the *Great Exposition of the Middle,* for a general introduction to the reasoning of the lack of being one or many.[b] There Jam-yang-shay-pa says:[c]

> What are the main reasonings refuting true establishment? Except for several reasons in which dependent-arising and existence are stated as signs, true establishment is refuted in dependence on signs that are non-observations of a related object. For, Shānta-rakṣhita's *Ornament for the Middle* sets forth the lack of being one

---

[a] *Explanation of "Tenets": Sun of the Land of Samantabhadra Brilliantly Illuminating All of Our Own and Others' Tenets and the Meaning of the Profound [Emptiness], Ocean of Scripture and Reasoning Fulfilling All Hopes of All Beings* (*grub mtha' chen mo / grub mtha'i rnam bshad rang gzhan grub mtha' kun dang zab don mchog tu gsal ba kun bzang zhing gi nyi ma lung rigs rgya mtsho skye dgu'i re ba kun skong*).

[b] For an excellent extensive presentation of the reasoning of the lack of being one or many, see Lopez, *A Study of Svātantrika,* 167-191 and 356-379.

[c] Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound,* 782-785 passim; Taipei, 520.15ff.

and many in dependence on statements of the lack of being one and many by the *Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra,* the *Meeting of Father and Son Sūtra,* and the Superior [Nāgārjuna] and his spiritual son [Āryadeva]. The following are quoted; the *Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra* says:

> Just as although forms devoid
> Of oneness and otherness
> Appear in a mirror but do not exist,
> So is the inherent nature of things.

and the *Meeting of Father and Son Sūtra* says:

> Just as reflections
> Without inherent existence
> Appear in a very clean mirror,
> Understand phenomena [such as] trees.

and so forth, and Āryadeva's *Four Hundred Stanzas on the Yogic Deeds of Bodhisattvas* says:

> Things that are investigated
> Do not have oneness.
> In those in which oneness does not exist,
> Manyness also does not exist.

Dharmakīrti's *Commentary on (Dignāga's) "Compilation of Prime Cognition"* says:

> Things upon definite investigation
> Are without thingness [that is, true establishment] in reality,
> For they do not have a nature
> Of oneness or manyness.

and so forth.

Also, Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle* sets forth the vajra nodes,[a] the refutation of production of the existent and the

[a] Hopkins reports: Kensur Lekden said that this reasoning is called *rdo rje gzegs ma* because each of the four reasons is capable of overcoming a conception of inherent existence just as a piece of diamond has the hardness and so forth of a diamond. From this viewpoint, *gzegs ma* (**kaṇā*) would mean "piece," and hence "fragment" ("sliver" no longer strikes me as appropriate since it suggests a weak, thin piece, whereas these are fragments). However, according to Apte's dictionary, the Sanskrit term also means "facet"; this would seem to be most appropriate when speaking of diamonds (and more appropriate to the meaning

> non-existent, the refutation of production from the four alternatives, and the lack of being one or many; it also explains dependent-arising, which is a reason that is an observation of a contradictory object. Since all phenomena—compounded and uncompounded—are delineated by way of the lack of being one or many, that a certain [scholar] considers part and whole only with regard to effective things is a sign of weak intelligence.

Ngag-wang-pal-dan's word commentary on Jam-yang-shay-pa's root text states the reasoning succinctly:[a]

> To state an example: Because of lacking being a truly established one or many, forms and so forth do not truly exist, as is the case, for example, with the reflection of a face in a mirror.
>
> To establish the forward-entailment and counter-entailment: Whatever is truly established is limited to the two, truly existent one or many.
>
> To prove the presence of the reason in the subject: It is not a truly established one because of having parts; it is not a truly established many because a truly established one does not exist.

To return to Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Great Exposition of Tenets:*[b]

> These things do not truly exist because in reality they lack a nature of being one or many, as is the case, for example, with a reflection.
>
> Whatever truly exists are limited to being either a truly established one or a truly established many, and also whatever are not established as either of those is necessarily without true existence because those are contradictory in the sense of mutual exclusion;[c] it is like the fact, for example, that whatever exists is necessarily either one or many…
>
> The presence of the reason in the subject is also established: It is not a truly existent one because of having parts, and it is not

---

since each of the four reasons alone actually is not capable of refuting inherent existence); however, none of my Tibetan sources, oral or written, has explained it this way. The oral traditions that I have contacted are by no means always accurate; nevertheless, when put together, the various oral strains are quite full and no Tibetan scholar to date has given this explanation. One Tibetan scholar said that *gzegs ma* refers to the nodes, or points, of a vajra; this accords with the sense of these reasonings being instruments that break apart mountains of wrong view. Thus, for the time being, I am translating this as "vajra nodes."

[a] Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound,* 784.

[b] Ibid.; Taipei, 521.9.

[c] *phan tshun spangs 'gal.*

> a truly existent many because a truly existent one does not exist.

Ngag-wang-pal-dan's *Annotations* turns to Tsong-kha-pa for more detail:[a]

> In brief, Tsong-kha-pa's *The Essence of Eloquence* says:
>
>> With respect to the final boundary for demonstrating to another a composite of contradictions, they refute ultimately established phenomena:
>>
>> - upon demonstrating that, among whatever is asserted by our own and others' schools, there does not occur anything partless that does not have many parts such as a temporal series, parts of an object, aspects of an object of consciousness, and so forth,
>> - they demonstrate that, if something is established as possessing many parts, although there is no contradiction among conventional objects for one phenomenon to exist as an essence [or entity] of many parts, within being ultimately established there is the damage that:
>>   1. if the two—parts and parts-possessor [whole]—are different entities, they would be unrelated
>>   2. if they are one entity, the parts would become one or the whole would become many.

Here in the *Great Exposition of the Middle* Jam-yang-shay-pa considers such topics as whether this reasoning should be called "lack of being either one truth or many truths" (it seems it should not) and whether this reasoning is a correct sign proving only a convention (it should because the reason itself contains the meaning of emptiness).

Along the way, Jam-yang-shay-pa points out that the Consequentialists assert space's establishment from its own side as the measure of space's establishment as its own mode of subsistence, and that nobody from the Autonomists on down has such a subtle assertion, but that this does not mean that the Consequentialists hold that the proponents of those other schools do not ascertain with valid cognition that the mode of subsistence is nonproduced. For instance, for non-Consequentialists to realize that a pot is an effective thing, their realization does not have to be qualified by the absence of inherent existence. Otherwise, it would absurdly follow that no phenomenon is established with valid cognition by anyone but the Consequentialists!

In the quoted material above, the example used in the reasoning of the

[a] Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound,* 784-785; *dbu ma pa, ta,* 99.1.

lack of being one and many is a reflection in a mirror; in other places the example is a magician's illusion. In India, pebbles or sticks are used as bases for a magician's conjuring; the magician recites a mantra as a spell, and the pebbles or sticks appear as horses and elephants. Jam-yang-shay-pa makes it clear that the message of the example is not that just as although magical illusions appear as horses and elephants, they are empty of those, so although phenomena such as a pot and so forth appear as a pot and so forth, they are empty of being a pot and so forth. He reports that some have taken this to be meaning of self-emptiness, but he says it is not, for if it were the proper meaning of self-emptiness, nothing would be itself, in which case even self-emptiness would not be self-emptiness! Rather, the actual message of the example of a magician's illusion is that just as magical illusions appear as horses and elephants but are empty of those, so phenomena such as a pot and so forth appear to be inherently or truly existent but are empty of that status of inherent existence. This is the meaning of self-emptiness, not that objects are empty of themselves.

The section of sixteen refutations of others' mistakes ends with clarifying that all phenomena have parts; it is not that just physical, material phenomena have parts, and not that just what is compounded from causes and conditions such as consciousnesses have parts, but even uncompounded space, nirvāṇa, and so forth have parts. This move allows the reasoning of the lack of being one and many to apply to all phenomena, the impermanent and the permanent.

Presenting our own system on the object of negation in the Autonomy School

Jam-yang-shay-pa's presentation of his own system centers on how Tsong-kha-pa creatively expands on a statement in Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle* so it clearly identifies the object of negation, true existence or ultimate existence, in terms of the innate apprehension of true existence. As mentioned briefly above, Tsong-kha-pa does this through finding a supposedly clear exposition in Kamalashīla's text of conventional existence and then drawing out its counterpart, ultimate existence. Let us look into this.

In this passage in the *Illumination of the Middle* Kamalashīla cites a stanza from the *Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra:*[a]

The production of things [exists] conventionally (*kun rdzob tu*,

[a] *dbu ma snang ba, madhyamakāloka;* sde dge 3887, *dbu ma,* vol. *sa,* 228a.7-228b.3.

> *saṃvṛtyā*);
> Ultimately it lacks inherent existence.
> That [consciousness] mistaken with regard to the lack of inherent existence
> Is asserted as the obscurer of reality (*yang dag kun rdzob*, *satyaṃ saṃvṛti*).

The problem for Tsong-kha-pa is that the word for "conventional" appears twice in the stanza, in the first line as *kun rdzob tu*, ***saṃvṛtyā*** and in the fourth line as *yang dag kun rdzob*, *satyaṃ* ***saṃvṛti***. The last two lines speak about the ignorance that—due to not understanding the absence of inherent existence—obscures reality; as Tsong-kha-pa cogently describes it, this is a consciousness that is "an apprehender of true existence" (*bden 'dzin*). Given that this is the meaning of *saṃvṛti* in the fourth line, the intuitive reading of the first line would seem to be that "the production of things exists obscurationally," that is to say, for such an ignorant consciousness.

However, Tsong-kha-pa attempts to justify a different meaning for *saṃvṛti* in the first line by citing Kamalashīla's commentary:

> Therefore, all entities of false things—[existing] through the power of their [that is, sentient beings'] mentations—are said "only to exist conventionally."

Tsong-kha-pa takes "mentations" (*bsam pa*)[a] widely as both conceptual consciousnesses and nonconceptual consciousnesses:

> The "mentations" of those living beings are not just conceptual consciousnesses but also are to be taken as non-conceptual consciousnesses.
>
> False things—that is to say, that do not exist ultimately but are posited as existing through the force of those two [conceptual and non-conceptual consciousnesses]—exist only conventionally. This is the meaning of the statement in the [*Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra*], "The production of things [exists] conventionally (*kun rdzob tu, saṃvṛtyā*)." Moreover, this does not mean that [such falsities] exist conventionally in the sense of existing for a *saṃvṛti* (*kun rdzob*) that is an apprehender of true existence [as it does in the final line of the same passage].

The hinge of Tsong-kha-pa's argument is the meaning of Kamalashīla's term "mentations," which he reads not as the ignorance obscuring reality but as conceptual and non-conceptual consciousnesses in the face of which

[a] Or "thoughts" as Hopkins translates the term.

objects are posited as existing. Tsong-kha-pa does not cite it, but just three sentences later, Kamalashīla himself offers another explanation:[a]

> Also, with regard to the proposition that "[All things are] conventionally produced" and so forth [that is to say, "and are not ultimately produced"], it is asserted that the meaning is this:
>
> > Because the aforementioned mistaken entity—the obscurer (*kun rdzob, saṃvṛti*)—displays all things as if produced even though in reality they are not produced, it is said that due to the power of [all living beings'] mentations things are conventionally produced.
>
> Therefore, the Buddha [in the *Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra*] says, "The production of things [exists] conventionally (*kun rdzob tu, saṃvṛtyā*)."

གང་ཡང་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་སྐྱེ་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ལ་སོགས་པ་སྨྲས་པ་དེ་ལ་ཡང་དོན་ནི་འདི་ཡིན་པར་བརྗོད་པར་འདོད་དེ། གང་གི་ཕྱིར་ཀུན་རྫོབ་འཁྲུལ་པའི་ངོ་བོ་ཇི་སྐད་བཤད་པས་དངོས་པོ་རྣམས་ཡང་དག་པར་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་ཀྱང་། སྐྱེ་བ་ལྟ་བུར་ཉེ་བར་སྟོན་པར་བྱེད་པ་དེའི་ཕྱིར་དེ་དག་གི་བསམ་པའི་དབང་གིས་དངོས་པོ་རྣམས་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་སྐྱེའོ་ཞེས་བྱའོ། །དེ་ཉིད་ཀྱི་ཕྱིར་བཅོམ་ལྡན་འདས་ཀྱིས། དངོས་རྣམས་སྐྱེ་བ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་སོ།

Has Tsong-kha-pa found the key for unlocking the meaning of this passage? According to his reading, one type of *saṃvṛti,* obscurative ignorance, displays phenomena as if ultimately produced, but another type of *saṃvṛti,* conceptual consciousnesses and nonconceptual consciousnesses, are the valid means of positing the conventional existence of phenomena. Or is it that Tsong-kha-pa's identification of the meaning of *kun rdzob tu* (*saṃvṛtyā*) in the first line of the passage in the *Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra* as meaning "conventionally" based on Kamalashīla's mention of "mentations" differs from Kamalashīla's thought in this presentation of the meaning of the same with the result that the passage from the *Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra* should read:

---

[a] *Illumination of the Middle,* 229a.7-229b.1.

> The production of things [exists] obscurationally (*kun rdzob tu*, *saṃvṛtyā*);
> Ultimately it lacks inherent existence.
> That [consciousness] mistaken with regard to the lack of inherent existence
> Is asserted as the obscurer of reality (*yang dag kun rdzob*, *satyaṃ saṃvṛti*).

If read this way, Kamalashīla would be saying that things exist and are produced only in the face of the ignorance superimposing true existence.

Evidence suggesting this very reading is found in Kamalashīla's *Difficult Points in (Shāntarakṣhita's) "Ornament for the Middle"*[a] where he comments on stanza 63ab in Shāntarakṣhita's text:[b]

> Therefore, these things hold
> Only the character of the conventional.

དེ་ཕྱིར་དངོས་པོ་འདི་དག་ནི།།
ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཁོ་ནའི་མཚན་ཉིད་འཛིན།།

Expanding on the meaning of the stanza, Kamalashīla says:

> *[Someone] thinks:* If these things ultimately do not have an inherent nature, well then implicitly what is their character?
> [*Answer:* Shāntarakṣhita] states "Therefore, these things…" and so forth. Since mistaken awarenesses obstruct the suchness of things, all mistaken awarenesses are obscurers. Because of abiding as entities imputed through the power of mentations that are mistaken awarenesses, those that exist for these [mistaken mentations] are obscurationals.

གལ་ཏེ་དངོས་པོ་འདི་དག་དོན་དམ་པར་རང་བཞིན་མེད་ན། འོ་ན་ཤུགས་ཀྱིས་འདི་དག་གི་མཚན་ཉིད་ཅི་ཞིག་ཡིན་པར་འགྱུར་སྙམ་པ་ལ། དེའི་ཕྱིར་དངོས་པོ་འདི་དག་ནི་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ལ་སོགས་

---

[a] *dbu ma rgyan gyi dka' 'grel.*

[b] For the Tibetan text, see Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla, *Madhyamakālaṁkāra of Śāntarakṣita: With His Own Commentary or Vṛtti and with the Subcommentary or Pañjikā of Kamalaśīla*, critically ed. by Ichigō Masamichi (Kyoto, Japan: Kyoto Sangyo University, 1985), 196-197.

པ་སྨོས་ཏེ། འཁྲུལ་པའི་བློས་དངོས་པོའི་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་བསྒྲིབས་
པས་བློ་འཁྲུལ་བ་ཐམས་ཅད་ནི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཡིན་ནོ། འཁྲུལ་པའི་
བློའི་བསམ་པའི་དབང་གིས་བརྟགས་པའི་བདག་ཉིད་དུ་གནས་
པའི་ཕྱིར་དེ་ལ་ཡོད་པ་ནི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་པ་ཡིན་ནོ།།

Here, Kamalashīla explicitly specifies "mentations that are mistaken awarenesses," leaving no room for identifying them as "nonconceptual and conceptual awarenesses" as Tsong-kha-pa does, since these are taken to be "obscurers," the ignorant consciousnesses that due to not understanding the lack of inherent existence obscure reality—that is, consciousnesses apprehending true existence (*bden 'dzin*). Still, forced to take Kamalashīla's own explanation this way, we are left with the dilemma that for Kamalashīla the conventionally existent merely exist for ignorance and thus are the obscurationally existent, having no more status than the horns of a rabbit. Still, it has to be admitted that this reading is quite uncomfortable in a system that likely upholds the valid establishment of conventional phenomena. Perhaps Tsong-kha-pa has revealed what Kamalashīla *should* have said in order to relieve this internal contradiction while at the same time demonstrating an identification of true existence in terms of an innate apprehension of true existence.

In any case, let us turn to seeing just how Tsong-kha-pa draws out from Kamalashīla's commentary the meaning of ultimate or true existence in terms of the innate apprehension of true existence. Tsong-kha-pa recasts Kamalashīla's statement:

> All entities of false things—[existing] through the power of those [living beings'] mentations—are said "only to exist conventionally/obscurationally."

དེ་དག་གི་བསམ་པའི་དབང་གིས་དངོས་པོ་བརྫུན་པའི་ངོ་བོ་
ཐམས་ཅད་ནི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་ཡོད་པ་ཁོ་ནའོ་ཞེས་བྱའོ།

into his own terms so that its implicit meaning—true existence, the object of negation in terms of the innate apprehension of true existence—can be articulated. He says:[a]

---

[a] Hopkins, *Tsong-kha-pa's Final Exposition of Wisdom,* 192. The Tibetan is from Tsong kha pa, *Illumination of the Thought,* 131.

> Since this is the case, [in the Autonomy School] "existing in the manner of an objective mode of abiding without being posited through appearing to an awareness, or through the force of an awareness" is to truly exist, to ultimately exist, and to exist as [the object's own] reality, and apprehending such is an innate apprehension of true existence.

དེ་ལྟར་བྱས་ན་བློ་ལ་སྣང་བའམ་བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་མིན་པར་དོན་གྱི་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་ཡོད་པ་ནི། བདེན་པ་དང་དོན་དམ་དང་ཡང་དག་པར་ཡོད་པ་དང་དེར་འཛིན་པ་ནི་བདེན་འཛིན་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་སོ།

The independence of the object—its true existence—is indicated by "without being posited through the power of appearing to an awareness, or through the force of an awareness." It is as if one's awareness does not influence the existence of the object at all. The word "without (*min par*)" makes Tsong-kha-pa's restatement opposite from Kamalashīla's exposition that things only exist conventionally *through the power of mentations*. Tsong-kha-pa understands mentations as Kamalashīla's prerequisite for explaining all things as conventionally existing; that is, *without* the power of mentations, nothing would exist conventionally. He does this by changing "through the power of mentations" in Kamalashīla's statement to "through the power of appearing to an awareness, or through the power of an awareness," thereby emphasizing that mentations are not mistaken awarenesses since they allow things to conventionally exist.

True existence is the very opposite of this conventional existence. Conventional existence itself depends upon the force of mentations—conceptual and non-conceptual awarenesses, whereas true establishment excludes the role of awarenesses from its appearance.[a] In this way Tsong-kha-pa signifies that true existence is seemingly dissociated from what appears to an awareness. By bringing in "posited," Tsong-kha-pa explains that the role of mentations, or awarenesses, is to posit, or certify things as conventionally existent.

Tsong-kha-pa also converts the status of the object in Kamalashīla's

---

[a] It does not mean that he excludes all types of consciousness from the appearance of true existence because as Kamalashīla would agree, true existence appears through the power of an obscurer, or mistaken awareness.

statement, "All entities of false things…are said 'only to exist conventionally'" into its opposite. He converts "All entities of false things" into the mode of true existence: "existing in the manner of an objective mode of abiding," and Kamalashīla's "only to exist conventionally" into its opposite: "to truly exist." Then, he adds "apprehension of such is an innate apprehension of true existence" to introduce the notion of the apprehending consciousness and to summarize his point.

Unlike the object of negation in terms of the intellectually imbued apprehension of true existence that is only apprehended in dependence upon scriptures and/or reasonings, this type of true existence is innately and beginninglessly apprehended by all beings. Hence, Tsong-kha-pa says that this innate apprehension of true existence is a subtler mode of misapprehension, and its object can be called the object of negation in terms of the innate apprehension of true existence.

As Kamalashīla himself says in the *Illumination of the Middle:*[a]

> A mistaken awareness that superimposes—on things that in reality [or ultimately] are natureless—an aspect opposite to that [naturelessness] is called an "obscurer" (*kun rdzob, saṃvṛti*) because it obstructs [itself] from [perception of] suchness or because it veils [other awarenesses] from perception of suchness. [The *Descent into Laṅkā*] *Sūtra* also says:
>
> > The production of things [exists] conventionally/ obscurationally (*kun rdzob tu, saṃvṛtyā*);
> > Ultimately it lacks inherent existence.
> > That [consciousness] mistaken with regard to the lack of inherent existence
> > Is asserted as the obscurer of reality (*yang dag kun rdzob, satyaṃ saṃvṛti*).
>
> All false things seen [by sentient beings] displayed by that [mistaken awareness] due to having arisen from it are called "just obscurational." Moreover, that [mistaken awareness] arises through the maturation of predispositions [established] by beginningless mistake. Also by means of that [mistaken awareness] all living beings see [phenomena] displayed as if they had an inherent nature in reality. Therefore, all entities of false things—[existing] through the power of those [living beings'] mentations—are said "only to exist conventionally/ obscurationally."

[a] Adapted from Hopkins, *Tsong-kha-pa's Final Exposition of Wisdom,* 191. The Tibetan is from Tsong-kha-pa, *Illumination of the Thought,* 130.

དངོས་པོ་ཡང་དག་པར་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་མེད་པ་དག་ལ་ཡང་དེ་ལས་
ཟློག་པའི་རྣམ་པར་སྒྲོ་འདོགས་པའི་འཁྲུལ་པའི་བློ་གང་ཡིན་པ་
དེ་ནི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཅེས་བྱ་སྟེ། འདིའམ་འདིས་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་སྒྲིབ་པ་
ལྟ་བུར་བྱེད། འགེབས་པ་ལྟ་བུར་བྱེད་པའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །དེ་སྐད་དུ་
མདོ་ལས་ཀྱང་། དངོས་རྣམས་སྐྱེ་བ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ། །དམ་པའི་དོན་
དུ་རང་བཞིན་མེད། །རང་བཞིན་མེད་ལ་འཁྲུལ་པ་གང་། །དེ་ནི་
ཡང་དག་ཀུན་རྫོབ་འདོད། །ཅེས་གསུངས་སོ། །དེ་ལས་བྱུང་བའི་
ཕྱིར་དེས་ཉེ་བར་བསྟན་པ་མཐོང་བའི་དངོས་པོ་བརྫུན་པ་ཐམས་
ཅད་ནི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་པ་ཁོ་ན་ཡིན་ཞེས་བྱའོ། །དེ་ཡང་ཐོག་མ་མེད་
པའི་འཁྲུལ་པའི་བག་ཆགས་ཡོངས་སུ་སྨིན་པའི་དབང་གིས་བྱུང་
ལ། དེས་ཀྱང་སྲོག་ཆགས་ཐམས་ཅད་ལ་ཡང་དག་པར་དངོས་
པོའི་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་ལྟ་བུར་ཉེ་བར་སྟོན་པར་འགྱུར་ཏེ། དེའི་ཕྱིར་དེ་
དག་གི་བསམ་པའི་དབང་གིས་དངོས་པོ་བརྫུན་པའི་ངོ་བོ་ཐམས་
ཅད་ནི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་ཡོད་པ་ཁོ་ནའོ་ཞེས་བྱའོ།

Tsong-kha-pa has creatively reworked the various elements of this statement to bring to the fore a possible presentation of ultimate existence, the object of negation, in accordance with an innate misapprehension. It is a brilliant reshaping of Kamalashīla's system which Jam-yang-shay-pa encapsulates in this section of Our Own System as:

> The two, the measure of true establishment and the measure of establishment in conventional terms in this system, exist because:
>
> - **establishment as its own mode of abiding without being only posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness** is the measure of true establishment, and
> - **establishment as only posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness** is the measure of conventional establishment, and

- **an awareness (1) apprehending [phenomena] as established that way [that is, as established as their own mode of abiding without being only posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness] and (2) not polluted by tenets** is an innate conceptual consciousness apprehending true establishment, and
- since an apprehension of true existence obstructs the suchness[a] of reality as if veiling it with a cloth, it is described as "obscurational" (*kun rdzob, saṃvṛti*).

Dispelling objections to outflows of this presentation

Over the course of six debates Jam-yang-shay-pa

1. clarifies the boundaries of central terminology in order to maintain distinctions between the Autonomy School and the Consequence School
2. clarifies the boundaries of central terminology in order to maintain distinctions between the Autonomy School and lower schools.

1. Clarifying the boundaries of central terminology in order to maintain distinctions between the Autonomy School and the Consequence School (debates 17-19)

A nonexistent like the horns of a rabbit, despite being established as only posited through the force of an awareness (*blo la snang ba'i dbang gis bzhag tsam du grub pa*), is neither established in conventional terms (*tha snyad du grub pa*) nor conventionally established (*kun rdzob tu grub pa*). This leads to the qualm that if even a nonexistent is established as only posited through the force of an awareness, then all existents, that is, all phenomena, must be established as *only* posited through the force of an awareness, the subject's side, in which case it would to be difficult for Autonomists to hold that all phenomena are established from their own side, which means the object's side, but Jam-yang-shay-pa points out that Autonomists do not find these to be contradictory. His unstated point is the

[a] That is to say, a consciousness apprehending true existence obstructs the perception of suchness.

Consequentialists find these two positions to be contradictory.

Then, the next point is: If Autonomists hold that all phenomena are established as only posited through the force of an awareness and both conceptual and non-conceptual consciousnesses exist in that "awareness," it flows from this that all phenomena are only posited through the force of appearing to a conceptual consciousness. Jam-yang-shay-pa accepts that the Autonomists assert this, but he does not allow that they therefore assert that all phenomena are only *imputed* by a conceptual consciousness, the latter being the position of the Consequence School. As Jam-yang-shay-pa succinctly says:

> an object posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective conceptual consciousness requires that the object exist in the mode of abiding in accordance with how it is apprehended by that [non-defective conceptual consciousness], but due to the phrase "only imputed by a conceptual consciousness" [an object only imputed by a conceptual consciousness] requires [an object] not in accordance with the mode of abiding superimposed by this [conceptual consciousness].

2. Clarifying the boundaries of central terminology in order to maintain distinctions between the Autonomy School and lower schools (debates 20-22)

Since lower schools of tenets know that impermanent and permanent objects are posited through the force of the two valid cognitions—direct perception and inference, which are non-defective awarenesses—it might seem that lower schools of tenets realize that all phenomena are conventionally established in the way that the Autonomy School presents conventional establishment because, as indicated above, Jam-yang-shay-pa holds that in the Autonomy School:

> **establishment as only posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness** is the measure of conventional establishment.

However, Jam-yang-shay-pa offers this highly provocative distinction:

> these [Proponents of True Existence] accept that [forms and so forth] appearance to a non-defective awareness itself as the mode of abiding of those objects and accept (1) that there is nothing

more than [forms and so forth] being posited *over there* through the force of appearing [to a non-defective awareness] and (2) that the comprehension of the mode of abiding of objects of comprehension by the two valid cognitions is the positing of objects of comprehension.

Put another way, the lower schools propound that objects have their own uncommon mode of abiding (*thun mong ma yin pa'i sdod lugs*) over there on the object's side, whereas the Autonomists assert that objects have a common, or shared, mode of subsistence (*thun mong ba'i gnas lugs*) with the subject's side.

The final two debates concern how to deal with the fact that both Autonomists and Consequentialists use the same terminology but with different meanings. Jam-yang-shay-pa's central point is that Autonomists assert phenomena to exist the way they appear to be inherently existent whereas Consequentialists do not.

Editions consulted

A single basic edition of Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Decisive Analysis of the Middle* was consulted:

1. *dbu ma la 'jug pa'i mtha' dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang 'jug ngogs*. TBRC W22186-I1KG10676: 1-442a.3, which is a PDF of: *bla brang bkra shis 'khyil,* a mdo.[a] Abbreviated reference: "2011 TBRC bla brang."

This edition was originally printed in La-brang-tra-shi-khyil monastery founded by Jam-yang-shay-pa and is the mother edition of four other editions utilized:

2. *dbu ma la 'jug pa'i mtha' dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang 'jug ngogs*. In the *Collected Works of 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bźad-pa'i-rdo-rje:* Reproduced from prints from Bkra-shis-'khyil Blocks, 15 vols., vol. 9, Gedan Sungrab Minyam Gyunphel Series. New Delhi: Ngawang Gelek Demo, 1973. Abbreviated reference: "1973 Ngawang Gelek *bla brang*."
3. *dbu ma la 'jug pa'i mtha' dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang 'jug ngogs*. TBRC W21503.9: 1-442a.3, a PDF of: Mundgod, South India: Gomang College, 1997 (revision of the 1973

[a] This edition was provided to the UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies by the late E. Gene Smith (1936-2010) in 2010.

Ngawang Gelek Demo edition). Abbreviated reference: "1997 revision of Ngawang Gelek *bla brang*."

4. *dbu ma la 'jug pa'i mtha' dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang 'jug ngogs*. Taipei reprint (published by the Corporate Body of the Buddha Educational Foundation, Taipei, Taiwan, 2007) of the 1999 codex (Mundgod, India: Go-mang Library, 1999) based on the 1995 Mundgod revision (Mundgod, India: Go-mang College, 1995) of the 1973 Ngawang Gelek *bla brang* edition (New Delhi, India: Ngawang Gelek Demo, 1973). Abbreviated reference: "2007 Taipei codex reprint."
5. The digital Tibetan text of Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Great Exposition of the Middle* provided in this book was supplied by the Drepung Gomang Library of Go-mang College in Mundgod, Karnataka State, India. It is likely a slightly revised version of the 1999 codex mentioned in item #4. It has been edited in accordance with the "2011 TBRC bla brang" and other sources.

The production of this book benefitted greatly from consultations with Losang-gyal-tshan, Ge-she at Go-mang College in Mundgod, Karnataka State, India, who also served for a term as Disciplinarian at the Gyu-may Tantric College in Hunsur, India. He resolved the meaning of many passages in Ngag-wang-pal-dan's commentary and edited and contributed to the interpolations into the Tibetan text.

I also wish to thank Dr. Elizabeth Napper who read the entire manuscript and offered many helpful editorial suggestions.

Jongbok Yi

Jam-yang-shay-pa's *GREAT EXPOSITION OF THE MIDDLE*

The Tibetan text and the translation are highlighted in three colors: black, blue, and red. Blue colored statements present what Jam-yang-shay-pa considers to be right positions, while red colored statements represent what Jam-yang-shay-pa considers to be wrong positions. Black words are merely neutral information or function structurally. In the Tibetan, turquoise highlight indicates material added in place of ellipses, and magenta highlight sets off the ellipsis indicator.

I. Identifying the discordant class of knowledge of suchness {2 parts}

This section has two parts: 1) refuting quasi-identifications by Tibetans of the object of negation, in connection with the reasons for identifying the object of negation and 2) individually identifying the object of negation in the Autonomy School and the Consequence School.

གཉིས་པ་[དེ་ཉིད་ཤེས་པའི་མི་མཐུན་ཕྱོགས་ངོས་བཟུང་བ་]ལ། དགག་བྱ་ངོས་འཛིན་དགོས་པའི་རྒྱུ་མཚན་དང་སྦྱར་ཏེ་བོད་ཀྱི་དགག་བྱ་ངོས་འཛིན་ལྟར་སྣང་དགག ཐལ་རང་གི་དགག་བྱ་སོ་སོར་ངོས་འཛིན་པ་གཉིས།

A. Refuting quasi-identifications by Tibetans of the object of negation, in connection with the reasons for identifying the object of negation

Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation* [*of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'": Illumination of the Thought*] says:[a]

> With regard to delineating the absence of true existence in phenomena, if you do not understand well just what true establishment is, as well as how [phenomena] are apprehended as truly existent, the view of suchness will definitely go astray. Shāntideva's *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds* says that if the thing imputed, the generality [or image] of the object of negation, does not appear well to your awareness, it is impossible to apprehend well the nonexistence of the object of negation:

---

[a] The translation is from Jeffrey Hopkins, *Tsong-kha-pa's Final Exposition of Wisdom* (Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Publications, 2008), 186; there are a few slight differences in choice of translation terms as indicated below when passages are cited. The ellipsis in Jam-yang-shay-pa's citation, indicated by *nas,* has been substituted with its contents. The Tibetan: Tsong kha pa blo bzang grags pa, *dbu ma la 'jug pa rgya cher bshad pa dgongs pa rab gsal* (Karnataka, India: Drepung Loseling Library Society, 1992), 128-129.

Without making contact with the thing imputed,
The nonexistence of that thing is not apprehended.

Therefore, unless true establishment, which is what does not exist, and the aspect of the object of negation, which is that of which [phenomena] are empty, do not appear—just as they are—as objects of [your] awareness, good ascertainment of the lack of true establishment and of the entity of emptiness cannot occur.

རྣམ་བཤད་ལས། ཆོས་རྣམས་བདེན་མེད་དུ་གཏན་ལ་འབེབས་པ་འདི་ལ་ནས། [བདེན་པར་གྲུབ་ཚུལ་དེ་ཇི་འདྲ་ཞིག་ཡིན་པ་དང་། བདེན་པར་འཛིན་ཚུལ་ལེགས་པར་མ་ཤེས་ན། དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་ཀྱི་ལྟ་བ་ངེས་པར་འཕྱུག་སྟེ། སྤྱོད་འཇུག་ལས། བརྟགས་པའི་དངོས་ལ་མ་རེག་པར། །དེ་ཡི་དངོས་མེད་འཛིན་མ་ཡིན། །ཞེས་བརྟགས་པའི་དངོས་པོ་སྟེ་དགག་བྱའི་སྤྱི་ལེགས་པར་བློ་ལ་མ་ཤར་ན། དགག་བྱ་དེ་མེད་པ་ལེགས་པར་འཛིན་མི་ནུས་པར་གསུངས་པས། མེད་རྒྱུའི་བདེན་གྲུབ་དང་། གང་གིས་སྟོང་པའི་དགག་བྱའི་རྣམ་པ་བློ་ཡུལ་དུ་ཇི་ལྟ་བ་བཞིན་མ་ཤར་ན། བདེན་མེད་དང་སྟོང་པའི་ངོ་བོ་ལེགས་པར་ངེས་པ་མི་སྲིད་དོ། །

Furthermore, mere identification of (1) a true establishment that is superficially imputed by proponents of tenets and (2) [the consciousness] apprehending such true establishment is not sufficient. Because of this, it is most essential to identify well the innate apprehension of true establishment that has operated beginninglessly and exists both in those whose awarenesses have been affected through [study of] tenets and in those whose awarenesses have not been affected in this way, and to identify the true establishment apprehended by this [mind]. For if you have not identified these, even if you refute an object of negation through reasoning, the adherence to true establishment that has operated beginninglessly is not harmed at all, due to which the meaning at this point would be lost.

Furthermore, having initially identified the apprehension of true establishment in your own [mental] continuum, you ought to know how the reasonings serve to disprove the object of that [apprehension] directly and indirectly. For, refutation and proof only directed outside are of very little benefit.

དེ་ཡང་གྲུབ་མཐའ་སྨྲ་བས་འཕྲལ་དུ་ཀུན་བརྟགས་པའི་བདེན་གྲུབ་དང་། བདེན་འཛིན་ངོས་ཟིན་པ་ཙམ་གྱིས་མི་ཆོག་པའི་ཕྱིར། ཐོག་མ་མེད་པ་ནས་རྗེས་སུ་ཞུགས་པ།

གྲུབ་མཐས་བློ་བསྒྱུར་མ་བསྒྱུར་གཉིས་ག་ལ་ཡོད་པའི་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཀྱི་བདེན་འཛིན་དང་། དེས་བཟུང་བའི་བདེན་གྲུབ་ལེགས་པར་ངོས་ཟིན་པ་ནི་གནད་ཤིན་ཏུ་ཆེ་སྟེ། དེ་ངོས་མ་ཟིན་པར་རིགས་པས་དགག་བྱ་བཀག་ཀྱང་། །ཐོག་མ་མེད་པ་ནས་ཞུགས་པའི་བདེན་ཞེན་ལ་ཅི་ཡང་མི་གནོད་པས་སྐབས་དོན་སྟོར་བར་འགྱུར་བའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །དེ་ཡང་ཐོག་མར་རང་གི་རྒྱུད་ཀྱི་བདེན་འཛིན་ངོས་ཟིན་ནས། དེའི་ཡུལ་སུན་འབྱིན་པ་ལ་རིགས་པ་རྣམས་དངོས་དང་བརྒྱུད་པས་འགྲོ་ལུགས་ཤེས་དགོས་ཀྱི། ཁ་ཕྱིར་ལྟ་འབབ་ཞིག་གི་དགག་སྒྲུབ་ནི་ཕན་]ཤིན་ཏུ་ཆུང་བའི་ཕྱིར། ཞེས་བྱུང་།།

1. As Tsong-kha-pa's "Questions on Points of Virtuous Endeavor: Shining Intention" says, many earlier Tibetan elders propounded in many ways: Even though one has not identified the object of negation, the non-dawning of any object to one's awareness and not thinking anything is to see, to realize the mode of subsistence, and so forth.

སྔོན་གྱི་བོད་རྒན་མང་པོ་ན་རེ། དྲི་བ་ལྷག་བསམ་རབ་དཀར་དུ་གསུངས་པ་ལྟར་དགག་བྱ་ངོས་མ་ཟིན་ཀྱང་ཡུལ་ཅི་ཡང་བློ་ལ་མ་ཤར་ཞིང་མ་བསམ་པ་དེ་གནས་ལུགས་[181b]མཐོང་བ་དང་རྟོགས་པ་སོགས་སུ་སྨྲ་བ་མང་ངོ་།

Our response: Well, for them, it [absurdly] follows that you realize the mode of subsistence of all the stable and the moving [that is to say, the inanimate and the animate] in worldly realms that you yourself do not know because aspects of those [that is, all the stable and the moving in worldly realms] do not dawn to your awareness and [according to you] the non-dawning of those is the meaning of seeing the mode of subsistence of these objects.

དེ་དག་ལ་འོ་ན། རང་གིས་མི་ཤེས་པའི་འཇིག་རྟེན་ཁམས་ཀྱི་བརྟན་གཡོ་དེ་དག་ཐམས་ཅད་ཀྱི་གནས་ལུགས་ཁྱོད་ཀྱིས་རྟོགས་པར་ཐལ། ཁྱོད་ཀྱི་བློ་ལ་ཡུལ་དེ་དག་གི་རྣམ་པ་ཅི་ཡང་མི་[248]འཆར་ལ། དེ་མ་ཤར་བ་ཡུལ་དེ་དག་གི་གནས་ལུགས་མཐོང་བའི་དོན་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

If you accept that [you realize the mode of subsistence of all the stable and the moving, that is to say, the inanimate and the animate, in worldly realms that you yourself do not know], it very absurdly follows that whatever is a non-view ignorance (*lta min gyi ma rig pa*) necessarily realizes emptiness!

[རང་གིས་མི་ཤེས་པའི་འཇིག་རྟེན་ཁམས་ཀྱི་བརྟན་གཡོ་དེ་དག་ཐམས་ཅད་ཀྱི་གནས་ལུགས་ཁྱོད་ཀྱིས་རྟོགས་པར་]འདོད་ན། ལྟ་མིན་གྱི་མ་རིག་པ་ཡིན་ན་སྟོང་ཉིད་རྟོགས་པས་ཁྱབ་པར་ཐལ་ལོ། །

Furthermore, it [absurdly] follows that, when the aspect of emptiness dawns [to an awareness], the aspect of the negative of its object of negation does not dawn because [according to you] the non-dawning of anything to an awareness is a realization of emptiness. You have accepted the reason [which is that the non-dawning of anything to an awareness is a realization of emptiness].

གཞན་ཡང་སྟོང་ཉིད་ཀྱི་རྣམ་པ་འཆར་བའི་ཚེ་རང་གི་དགག་བྱ་བཀག་པའི་རྣམ་པ་མི་འཆར་བར་ཐལ། བློ་ལ་ཅི་ཡང་མ་ཤར་བ་དེ་སྟོང་ཉིད་རྟོགས་པ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [བློ་ལ་ཅི་ཡང་མ་ཤར་བ་དེ་སྟོང་ཉིད་རྟོགས་པ་ཡིན་པར་]རྟགས་ཁས།

If you accept [that when the aspect of emptiness dawns to an awareness, the aspect of the negative of its object of negation does not dawn,] it [absurdly] follows that at that time [when the aspect of emptiness dawns,] the factor that is the negative of the object of negation—true establishment—does not dawn because you accepted [that when the aspect of emptiness dawns to an awareness, the aspect of the negative of its object of negation does not dawn].

[སྟོང་ཉིད་ཀྱི་རྣམ་པ་འཆར་བའི་ཚེ་རང་གི་དགག་བྱ་བཀག་པའི་རྣམ་པ་མི་འཆར་བར་]འདོད་ན། [སྟོང་ཉིད་ཀྱི་རྣམ་པ་འཆར་བ་]དེའི་ཚེ་རང་གི་དགག་བྱ་བདེན་གྲུབ་བཀག་པའི་ཆ་དེ་མི་འཆར་བར་ཐལ། [སྟོང་ཉིད་ཀྱི་རྣམ་པ་འཆར་བའི་ཚེ་རང་གི་དགག་བྱ་བཀག་པའི་རྣམ་པ་མི་འཆར་བར་]འདོད་པའི་ཕྱིར།

You cannot accept [that at that time the factor that is the negative of the object of negation, true establishment, does not dawn] because [emptiness] is a non-affirming negative that is a negative of true establishment.

[སྟོང་ཉིད་ཀྱི་རྣམ་པ་འཆར་བ་དེའི་ཚེ་རང་གི་དགག་བྱ་བདེན་གྲུབ་བཀག་པའི་ཆ་དེ་མི་འཆར་བར་]འདོད་མི་ནུས་ཏེ། [སྟོང་ཉིད་]བདེན་གྲུབ་བཀག་པའི་མེད་དགག་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

There is entailment [that if (emptiness) is a non-affirming negative that is a negative of true establishment, you cannot accept that when the aspect of emptiness dawns, the factor that is the negative of the object of negation—true establishment—does not dawn] because when meaning-generalities (*don spyi, arthasāmānya*) of non-affirming negatives dawn in dependence upon explicitly refuting their objects of negation, it is necessary that another phenomenon is not projected explicitly or implicitly, and with regard to this without the meaning-generality of the object of negation previously dawning to an awareness, the nonexistence that is the negative of it does not dawn to an awareness, because Shāntideva's *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds* says:[a]

> Without making contact with the thing imputed,
> The nonexistence of that thing is not apprehended.

[(སྟོང་ཉིད་)བདེན་གྲུབ་བཀག་པའི་མེད་དགག་ཡིན་ན་སྟོང་ཉིད་ཀྱི་རྣམ་པ་འཆར་བའི་ཚེ་རང་གི་དགག་བྱ་བདེན་གྲུབ་བཀག་པའི་ཆ་དེ་མི་འཆར་བར་འདོད་མི་ནུས་པས་]ཁྱབ་སྟེ། མེད་དགག་རྣམས་ཀྱི་དོན་སྤྱི་འཆར་བའི་ཚེ་རང་གི་དགག་བྱ་དངོས་སུ་བཀག་ནས་ཆོས་གཞན་དངོས་ཤུགས་གང་ལ་ཡང་མ་འཕངས་པ་གཅིག་དགོས་ལ། དེ་ལ་སྔོན་དུ་དགག་བྱའི་དོན་སྤྱི་བློ་ལ་མ་ཤར་བར་དེ་བཀག་པའི་དངོས་མེད་བློ་ལ་མི་འཆར་བའི་ཕྱིར། སྤྱོད་འཇུག་ལས། བརྟགས་པའི་དངོས་ལ་མ་

[a] IX.139ab; Shāntideva (*zhi ba lha,* fl. 8th century C.E.), *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds* (*byang chub sems dpa'i spyod pa la 'jug pa*), in *bstan 'gyur* (*sde dge*), TBRC W23703.105 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 36a.6; see also Shantideva, *A Guide to the Bodhisattva's Way of Life,* trans. Stephen Batchelor (Dharamsala, India: Library of Tibetan Works & Archives, 1979), 161. This stanza is part of the conclusion of a debate against the Sāṃkhya system.

རིག་པར། །དེ་ཡི་དངོས་མེད་འཛིན་མ་ཡིན། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

Moreover, it follows that with regard to realization of emptiness, a mere non-dawning of appearances of coarse conventionalities is not sufficient because with regard to that [realization of emptiness] a dawning of an aspect [that is, a generic image] of the naturelessness of those [conventional] objects is necessary, but without the dawning of that [aspect (that is, a generic image) of the naturelessness of those conventionalities] a mere non-appearance of those [conventional] objects is not sufficient.

གཞན་ཡང་སྟོང་ཉིད་རྟོགས་པ་ལ་ཡུལ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་རགས་པའི་སྣང་བ་མ་ཤར་བ་ཙམ་གྱིས་མི་ཚོག་པར་ཐལ། [སྟོང་ཉིད་རྟོགས་པ་]དེ་ལ་ཡུལ་[ཀུན་རྫོབ་པ་]དེ་དག་གི་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་མེད་པའི་རྣམ་པ་ཤར་བ་གཅིག་དགོས་ཀྱི་[ཀུན་རྫོབ་པ་དེ་དག་གི་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་མེད་པའི་རྣམ་པ་]དེ་མ་ཤར་བར་[182a]ཡུལ་[ཀུན་རྫོབ་པ་]དེ་དག་མི་སྣང་བ་ཙམ་གྱིས་མི་ཚོག་པའི་ཕྱིར།

It follows that [with regard to that (realization of emptiness) a dawning of an aspect (that is, a generic image) of the naturelessness of those objects is necessary, but without its dawning a mere non-appearance of those objects is not sufficient,] because (1) Buddhapālita asserts that for former and future births, for example, such is needed; and (2) the glorious Chandrakīrti also asserts such.

[(སྟོང་ཉིད་རྟོགས་པ་)དེ་ལ་ཡུལ་(ཀུན་རྫོབ་པ་)དེ་དག་གི་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་མེད་པའི་རྣམ་པ་ཤར་བ་གཅིག་དགོས་ཀྱི་(ཀུན་རྫོབ་པ་དེ་དག་གི་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་མེད་པའི་རྣམ་པ་)དེ་མ་ཤར་བར་ཡུལ་(ཀུན་རྫོབ་པ་)དེ་དག་མི་སྣང་བ་ཙམ་གྱིས་མི་ཚོག་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། དཔེར་ན་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་ལྟ་བུ་ལ་དེ་ལྟར་དགོས་པར་སློབ་དཔོན་སངས་རྒྱས་བསྐྱངས་བཞེད་པ་གང་ཞིག །ཟླ་བའི་ཞབས་ཀྱང་དེ་ལྟར་བཞེད་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The first [part of the reason which is that Buddhapālita asserts that for

former and future births, for example, such is needed] is established because the *Buddhapālita [Commentary]* says:[a]

> Just as these two [the view that the world does not exist and the view that all things are not produced] differ very greatly, so here also the perceptions [found in the texts of the Nihilists] such as, "This world does not exist," [meaning that this life is not the effect of other lives] are thoughts beclouded with ignorance. However, the others [that is, the Proponents of the Middle Way]—who see that all phenomena are not [inherently] produced and do not [inherently] cease because they are empty of inherent existence—have preceded their conclusion with the mind of analysis. Therefore, these two [Nihilists and Proponents of the Middle Way] are very different.[b]

---

[a] This is a response to the Nihilists' assertion that nonexistence and emptiness are equivalent. Their assertion and the first part of Buddhapālita's refutation go as follows:

> [The Nihilists say,] "This world [or life] does not exist [as an effect of past lives]. A future world does not exist. Also, spontaneously born sentient beings [such as hell-beings] do not exist," and so forth. What is the difference between their view and the view [of the Proponents of the Middle Way] that all things are not produced and do not cease?
>
> *[Answer:]* There is a great difference between these two. Not knowing the meaning of emptiness, you think that these two are similar. Acting with equanimity [that is, indifference] when one has not analyzed [to find that all sentient beings should be valued equally] and acting with equanimity when one has so analyzed are similar only in that both can be characterized as acting with equanimity. However, acting with equanimity but without analysis is involved in the entwinements of ignorance. Acting with equanimity when one has analyzed [is the result of knowledge and] is used by the Supramundane Victors.

See Jeffrey Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound* (Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Publications, 2003), 825.

[b] Buddhapālita (*sangs rgyas bskyangs,* ca. 470-540), *Buddhapālita Commentary on (Nāgārjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle" (dbu ma rtsa ba'i 'grel pa buddha pā li ta, buddhapālitamūlamadhyamakavṛtti),* sde dge 3842, *dbu ma,* vol. tsha, 243a.1-243a.7; see also Akira Saito, "A study of the Buddhapālita-Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti" (Ph.D. diss., Australian National University, Australia, 1984), 252-253. This passage is a part of Buddhapālita's commentary on stanza 7cd in Nāgārjuna's *Fundamental Treatise on the Middle, Called "Wisdom"* (*dbu ma rtsa ba shes rab, prajñānāmamūlamadhyamakakārikā*) in Chapter XVIII, Analysis of Self (*bdag brtag pa, ātmaparikṣā*) where he first cites the *Treatise* and then gives his commentary:

> མ་སྐྱེས་པ་དང་མ་འགགས་པ། ཆོས་ཉིད་མྱ་ངན་འདས་དང་མཚུངས།། …།སྨྲས་པ། གང་འཇིག་རྟེན་འདི་མེད་དོ། །འཇིག་རྟེན་ཕ་རོལ་མེད་དོ། །སེམས་ཅན་རྫུས་ཏེ་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་

[རྟགས་]དང་པོ་[དཔེར་ན་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་ལྟ་བུ་ལ་དེ་ལྟར་དགོས་པར་སློབ་དཔོན་སངས་རྒྱས་བསྐྱངས་བཞེད་པར་]གྲུབ་སྟེ། བུདྡྷ་པཱ་ལི་ཏ་ལས། [འཇིག་རྟེན་མེད་པར་ལྟ་བ་དང་། དངོས་པོ་ཐམས་ཅད་མ་སྐྱེས་པར་ལྟ་བ་]དེ་གཉིས་ལ་ཁྱད་པར་ཆེ་བ་དེ་བཞིན་དུ། འདི་ལ་ཡང་འཇིག་རྟེན་འདི་མེད་དོ་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ལ་སོགས་པ་དེ་ལྟར་མཐོང་བ་ནི་མ་རིག་པས་ཀུན་ཏུ་རྨོངས་པའི་སེམས་པ་དང་ལྡན་པ་ཡིན་གྱི་དངོས་པོ་ཐམས་ཅད་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་སྟོང་པའི་ཕྱིར་མ་སྐྱེས་པ་དང་མ་འགག་པར་མཐོང་བ་ཅིག་ཤོས་ནི་ཤེས་པ་སྔོན་དུ་བཏང་བ་ཡིན་པས་དེ་གཉིས་ལ་ཁྱད་པར་ཤིན་ཏུ་ཆེའོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

[This statement] entails [that Buddhapālita asserts that for former and future births, for example, such is needed] because it explains that [the Nihilists and the Proponents of the Middle Way] are very different due to the fact that the Nihilists' seeing [the mere non-appearance of those objects] is from the power of ignorance and the Proponents of the Middle Way see [phenomena] as not [inherently] produced and so forth by reason of the nonexistence of the inherent nature of all phenomena.

དོ། །ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ལ་སོགས་པར་ལྟ་བ་དེ་དང་། གང་དངོས་པོ་ཐམས་ཅད་མ་སྐྱེས་པ་དང་མ་འགགས་པ་ཞེས་བྱ་བར་ལྟ་བ་དེ་གཉིས་ལ་ཁྱད་པར་ཅི་ཡོད། བཤད་པ། དེ་གཉིས་ལ་ཁྱད་པར་ཤིན་ཏུ་ཆེ་ན།   ཁྱོད་ནི་སྟོང་པ་ཉིད་ཀྱི་དོན་རྣམ་པར་མི་ཤེས་ནས་དེ་གཉིས་འདྲའོ་སྙམ་དུ་སེམས་སོ།   །འདི་ལ་སོ་སོར་མ་བརྟགས་པར་བཏང་སྙོམས་བྱེད་པ་གང་ཡིན་པ་དང་། སོ་སོར་བརྟགས་ནས་བཏང་སྙོམས་བྱེད་པ་གང་ཡིན་པ་དེ་གཉིས་བཏང་སྙོམས་བྱེད་པར་ནི་འདྲ་མོད་ཀྱི་སོ་སོར་མ་བརྟགས་པར་བཏང་སྙོམས་བྱེད་པ་ནི་མ་རིག་པའི་ཀུན་ཏུ་སྦྱོར་བ་དང་ལྡན་པར་བསྟན་ལ།   བཏང་སྙོམས་བྱེད་གཅིག་ཤོས་ནི་སངས་རྒྱས་བཅོམ་ལྡན་འདས་རྣམས་ཀྱིས་ཀུན་ཏུ་བསྟན་པ་ཡིན་པས། དེ་གཉིས་ལ་ཁྱད་པར་ཤིན་ཏུ་ཆེ་བ་དེ་བཞིན་དུ།   འདི་ལ་ཡང་འཇིག་རྟེན་འདི་མེད་དོ་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ལ་སོགས་པ་དེ་ལྟར་མཐོང་བ་ནི་མ་རིག་པས་ཀུན་ཏུ་རྨོངས་པའི་སེམས་དང་ལྡན་པ་ཡིན་གྱི། དངོས་པོ་ཐམས་ཅད་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་ཀྱིས་སྟོང་པའི་ཕྱིར་མ་སྐྱེས་པ་དང་མ་འགགས་པར་མཐོང་བ་ཅིག་ཤོས་ནི་ཤེས་པ། སྔོན་དུ་བཏང་བ་ཡིན་པས།

[འདི་འདྲས་གསུངས་པ་ཡིན་ན་དཔེར་ན་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་ལྟ་བུ་ལ་དེ་ལྟར་དགོས་པར་སློབ་དཔོན་སངས་རྒྱས་བསྐྱངས་བཞེད་པས་]གྲུབ་སྟེ། མེད་ལྟ་བས་དེ་ལྟར་མཐོང་བ་མ་རིག་པའི་དབང་དང་དབུ་མ་པས་དངོས་པོ་ཐམས་ཅད་ཀྱི་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་མེད་པའི་རྒྱུ་མཚན་གྱིས་མ་སྐྱེས་པ་སོགས་སུ་ལྟ་བས་ཁྱད་པར་ཆེ་བ་བཤད་པའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །

The second [part of the reason which is that the glorious Chandrakīrti also asserts such] is established because Chandrakīrti's *Clear Words* says:

> Here some say, "The Proponents of the Middle Way are indistinguishable from Nihilists because they propound that virtuous and non-virtuous actions, agents, fruits, and all worlds [that is, lives][a] are empty of inherent existence, and the Nihilists also say that these are nonexistent. Therefore, Proponents of the Middle Way are indistinguishable from Nihilists."
>
> It is not so.
>
> "How?"
>
> The Proponents of the Middle Way are proponents of dependent-arising; they say that due to arising dependent on, or reliant on, causes and conditions all—this world, the next, and so forth—lack inherent existence. The Nihilists do not realize[b] future worlds [that is, future lives] and so forth as non-things[c] because of being empty of inherent existence due to being dependent-arisings.[d]

---

[a] Lives as fruits of moral actions.

[b] Skt. *pratipannāḥ*.

[c] "Non-things" (*dngos po med pa, abhāva*) could be translated as "without thingness." Since Chandrakīrti states that the Mādhyamikas assert that this world and so forth lack inherent existence when he says, "The Mādhyamikas are proponents of dependent-arising; they say that due to arising dependent on, or reliant on, causes and conditions all—this world, the next, and so forth—lack inherent existence," "non-things" needs to be understood in the context of the previous passage. That is, "non-thing" does not mere nonexistence or non-effective thing, but the absence of inherent or true existence.

[d] The text reads *zhes pa nas* which I have supplemented with the omitted part of the quote according to Chandrakīrti's *Clear Words*. See Chandrakīrti (*zla ba grags pa, fl. 7th century C.E.*), *Clear Words, Commentary on (Nāgārjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle"* (*dbu ma rtsa ba'i 'grel pa tshigs gsal ba, mūlamadhyamakavṛttiprasannapadā*), sde dge 3860, dbu ma, vol. 'a, 117b.6.

[རྟགས་]གཉིས་པ་[ཟླ་བའི་ཞབས་ཀྱང་དེ་ལྟར་བཞེད་པར་]སྒྲུབ་སྟེ། ཚིག་གསལ་ལས། འདིར་ཁ་ཅིག་དབུ་མ་པ་ནི་མེད་པ་པ་དང་ཁྱད་པར་མེད་པ་ཡིན་ཏེ། [249] ཞེས་པ་ནས། [།གང་གི་ཕྱིར་དགེ་བ་དང་མི་དགེ་བའི་ལས་དང་། བྱེད་པ་པོ་དང་། འབྲས་བུ་དང་། འཇིག་རྟེན་ཐམས་ཅད་རང་བཞིན་གྱིས་སྟོང་པར་སྨྲ་བ་ཡིན་ལ། །མེད་པ་པ་དག་ཀྱང་དེ་དག་མེད་དོ་ཞེས་སྨྲ་བར་བྱེད་པ་ཡིན་པ་དེའི་ཕྱིར། དབུ་མ་པ་ནི་མེད་པ་པ་དང་ཁྱད་པར་མེད་དོ་ཞེས་ཀློལ་པར་བྱེད་དོ།] དེ་ལྟར་ནི་མ་ཡིན་ཏེ། དབུ་མ་པ་དག་ནི་རྟེན་ཅིང་འབྲེལ་བར་འབྱུང་བ་སྨྲ་བ་ཡིན་ལ། རྟེན་ཅིང་འབྲེལ་བར་འབྱུང་བའི་ཕྱིར་འཇིག་རྟེན་འདི་དང་འཇིག་རྟེན་ཕ་རོལ་ལ་སོགས་པ་ཐམས་ཅད་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་སྨྲ་བར་བྱེད་དོ། །མེད་པ་པ་དག་གིས་ནི་དེ་ལྟར་རྟེན་ཅིང་འབྲེལ་བར་འབྱུང་བ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། རང་བཞིན་གྱིས་སྟོང་ཉིད་ཀྱི་སྒོ་ནས་འཇིག་རྟེན་ཕ་རོལ་ལ་སོགས་པ་དངོས་[182b]པོ་མེད་པར་རྟོགས་པ་མ་ཡིན་ཏེ། ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

Through these former and latter passages [by Buddhapālita and Chandrakīrti], understand the measure of realizing the view!
ལུང་སྔ་ཕྱི་འདི་གཉིས་ཀྱིས་ལྟ་བ་རྟོགས་ཚད་ཀྱང་ཤེས་པར་གྱིས།

2. Moreover, the Translator Tag-tshang says: Since, despite not knowing the details with regard to conventions (*tha snyad, vyāvahāra*), one can realize emptiness, conventions do not have to be validly established in order to realize emptiness because the ultimate is other[a] than conventionalities (*kun rdzob, saṃvṛti*).
ཡང་སྟག་ལོ་ན་རེ། ཐ་སྙད་ལ་ཞིབ་མོ་མི་ཤེས་ཀྱང་སྟོང་ཉིད་

[a] If "other" (*gzhan*) means different entity (*ngo bo gzhan*), Ge-lug scholars would not agree, and if it means just other (*gzhan*), that is to say, different, then they would agree because the relation between the two truths is the same entity but different isolates (*ngo bo gcig la ldog pa tha dad*).

རྟོགས་ནུས་པས་སྟོང་ཉིད་རྟོགས་པ་ལ་ཐ་སྙད་ཚད་གྲུབ་མི་དགོས་ཏེ། དོན་དམ་པ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ལས་གཞན་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར་ཟེར་ན།

Our response: It follows that without knowing [how to] posit the valid establishment of conventions it is impossible to realize naturelessness because without knowing [how to] posit valid establishment, it cannot be posited that emptiness is realized through holding that [phenomena] are natureless. It follows [that without knowing how to posit valid establishment, it cannot be posited that emptiness is realized through holding that phenomena are natureless] because [without knowing how to posit valid establishment,] with regard to former and later births [it cannot be posited that the emptiness of former and later births is realized through holding that former and later births are natureless].

ཐ་སྙད་ཚད་གྲུབ་འཇོག་མི་ཤེས་པར་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་རྟོགས་མི་སྲིད་པར་ཐལ། ཚད་གྲུབ་འཇོག་མི་ཤེས་པར་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་བཟུང་བས་སྟོང་ཉིད་རྟོགས་པར་འཇོག་མི་ཐུབ་པའི་ཕྱིར། [ཚད་གྲུབ་འཇོག་མི་ཤེས་པར་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་བཟུང་བས་སྟོང་ཉིད་རྟོགས་པར་འཇོག་མི་ཐུབ་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་ལྟ་བུ་ལ་[ཚད་གྲུབ་འཇོག་མི་ཤེས་པར་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་བཟུང་བས་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱིའི་སྟེང་གི་སྟོང་པ་ཉིད་རྟོགས་མི་ཐུབ་པ་]དེའི་ཕྱིར།

It follows that [without knowing how to posit valid establishment with regard to former and later births it cannot be posited that the emptiness of former and later births is realized through holding that former and later births are natureless] because the Diverged Afars'[a] holding former and later births as natureless, for example, is not a view of emptiness.

[a] *rgyang phan pa* (*āyata*) also called *lokāyata* (*'jig rten rgyang phan pa*). According to a Tibetan oral etymology explained by Ngag-wang-leg-dan (*ngag dbang legs ldan*), lokāyata (*'jig rten rgyang phan pa*) etymologically means "Flung Afar from the world" and is pejorative as Jam-yang-shay-pa says, "Because they have gone apart from the correct view, they are Diverged Afars [literally, Those Who Are Flung Afar]." See Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound,* 96. They are moral Nihilists.

[སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་ལྟ་བུ་ལ་ཚད་གྲུབ་འཇོག་མི་ཤེས་པར་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་བཟུང་བས་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱིའི་སྟེང་གི་སྟོང་པ་ཉིད་རྟོགས་མི་ཐུབ་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། དཔེར་ན། རྒྱང་ཕན་པས་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་བཟུང་བ་དེ་སྟོང་ཉིད་ཀྱི་ལྟ་བ་མ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

It follows [that the Diverged Afars' holding former and later births as natureless is not a view of emptiness] because the reason why the [Diverged Afars' holding former and later births as natureless] is a view of annihilation but the Middle Way Proponents' holding former and later births as natureless is a pure view is due to respectively [the Diverged Afars'] not asserting [former and later births] in conventional terms but [the Middle Way Proponents'] asserting [former and later births in conventional terms],

[རྒྱང་ཕན་པས་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་བཟུང་བ་དེ་སྟོང་ཉིད་ཀྱི་ལྟ་བ་མ་ཡིན་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། [རྒྱང་ཕན་པས་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་བཟུང་བ་]དེ་ཆད་ལྟ་ཡིན་ལ་དབུ་མ་པས་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་བཟུང་བ་དེ་ལྟ་བ་རྣམ་དག་ཡིན་པའི་རྒྱུ་མཚན་རིམ་བཞིན་དུ་[རྒྱང་ཕན་པས་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་]ཐ་སྙད་དུ་གྲུབ་པ་མི་འདོད་པ་དང་། [དབུ་མ་པས་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་གྲུབ་པ་]འདོད་པའི་དབང་གིས་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར་ཏེ།

because Chandrakīrti's *Clear Words* says:

> *[Objection:]* Nevertheless, because [the Diverged Afars] realize that the entity of the nature of those things is not existent, respective to that, they are similar by way of this view.
> *[Answer:]* They are not because the Proponents of the Middle Way assert them as conventionally existent, and because those [that is, the Diverged Afars] do not assert [such]. Hence they are not similar.

ཚིག་གསལ་ལས། གལ་ཏེ་དེ་ལྟ་ན་ཡང་དེ་དག་གི་དངོས་པོའི་

རང་བཞིན་གྱི་ངོ་བོར་ཡོད་པ་མིན་པ་ཉིད་དུ་རྟོགས་པའི་ཕྱིར་རེ་ཞིག་ལྟ་བ་འདིའི་སྒོ་ནས་མཚུངས་པ་ཡོད་དོ་ཞེ་ན་མེད་དེ་དབུ་མ་པ་དག་གིས་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་ཡོད་པར་ཁས་བླངས་པའི་ཕྱིར་ལ། དེ་དག་གིས་ཁས་མ་བླངས་པའི་ཕྱིར་མི་མཚུངས་སོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

Also, from Tsong-kha-pa's saying that until the view [of emptiness] is found, the difference between naturelessness (*rang bzhin med pa*) and nonexistence (*med pa*) is not distinguished, it is known [that without knowing how to posit the valid establishment of conventions it is impossible to realize naturelessness (*tha snyad tshad grub 'jog mi shes par rang bzhin med pa rtogs mi srid pa*)].

རྗེ་རིན་པོ་ཆེས་ལྟ་བ་མ་རྙེད་བར་དུ་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་དང་མེད་པའི་ཁྱད་པར་མི་ཕྱེད་གསུངས་པས་ཀྱང་ཤེས་སོ།།

3. With regard to the [difference between the Diverged Afars and the Proponents of the Middle Way on naturelessness and nonexistence,] someone says: It follows that the Diverged Afars' holding that former and later births are natureless is not a view of annihilation because although those [Diverged Afars] do not realize such [that is, the conventional establishment of former and later births, the Diverged Afars' holding that former and later births are natureless] accords with the Middle Way view and mode of holding [that former and later births are natureless]. It follows [that although those (Diverged Afars) do not realize such (that is, the conventional establishment of former and later births, the Diverged Afars' holding that former and later births are natureless) accords with the Middle Way view and mode of holding (that former and later births are natureless)] because (1) former and later births are natureless and (2) both of them [the Diverged Afars and the Proponents of the Middle] hold that those [former and later births] are natureless.

དེ་ལ་ཁོ་ན་རེ། རྒྱང་ཕན་པས་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་[183a]མེད་པར་བཟུང་བ་ཆད་ལྟ་མ་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། [རྒྱང་ཕན་པ་]དེས་[སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་གྲུབ་པ་]དེ་ལྟར་མ་རྟོགས་ཀྱང་[རྒྱང་ཕན་པས་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་

བཞིན་མེད་པར་བཟུང་བ་དེ་]དབུ་མའི་ལྟ་བ་དང་བཟུང་ཚུལ་མཐུན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [(རྒྱང་ཕན་པ་)དེས་(སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་གྲུབ་པ་)དེ་ལྟར་མ་རྟོགས་ཀྱང་། (རྒྱང་ཕན་པས་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་བཟུང་བ་དེ་)དབུ་མའི་ལྟ་བ་དང་བཟུང་ཚུལ་མཐུན་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་ལ་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་གང་ཞིག །[རྒྱང་ཕན་པ་དང་དབུ་མ་པ་]དེ་གཉིས་ཀས་[སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་]དེ་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་བཟུང་བའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: [That (1) former and later births are natureless and (2) both the Diverged Afars and the Proponents of the Middle hold that those former and later births are natureless] does not entail [that the Middle Way view and mode of holding that phenomena are natureless accord with the Diverged Afars' holding that former and later births are natureless] because although they are similar [in holding that] the objects, former and later births, are natureless, whether it is the Middle Way view or not are posited separately due to differences in the inner modes of the realizers' awarenesses.

[སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་ལ་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་གང་ཞིག་(རྒྱང་ཕན་པ་དང་དབུ་མ་པ་)དེ་གཉིས་ཀས་(སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་)དེ་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་བཟུང་ན་(རྒྱང་ཕན་པ་)དེས་(སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་གྲུབ་པ་)དེ་ལྟར་མ་རྟོགས་ཀྱང་། (རྒྱང་ཕན་པས་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་བཟུང་བ་དེ་)དབུ་མའི་ལྟ་བ་དང་བཟུང་ཚུལ་མཐུན་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ་སྟེ། ཡུལ་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་ལ་རང་བཞིན་མེད་[250]པར་མཚུངས་ཀྱང་རྟོགས་པ་པོའི་བློའི་ཞེ་ཕུག་ཐ་དད་པའི་དབང་གིས་དབུ་མའི་ལྟ་བ་ཡིན་མིན་སོ་སོར་བཞག་པའི་ཕྱིར།

It follows [that although they are similar in holding that the objects, former and later births, are natureless, whether it is the Middle Way view or not are posited separately due to differences in the inner modes of the realizers' awarenesses] because it is like, for example, when both someone who identified a robber man as a robber and another who did not identify such say, "He is the robber," it is posited that the one who knew the robber identified the robber and the other one did not identify the robber.

[ཡུལ་སྐྱེ་བ་སྡུ་ཕྱི་ལ་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་མཚུངས་ཀྱང་རྟོགས་པ་པོའི་བློའི་ཞེ་ཕུག་ཐ་དད་པའི་དབང་གིས་དབུ་མའི་ལྟ་བ་ཡིན་མིན་སོ་སོར་བཞག་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། དཔེར་ན་མི་རྒྱུན་མ་གཅིག་ལ་རྒྱུན་མར་ངོ་ཤེས་མ་ཤེས་གཉིས་ཀས་འདི་རྒྱུན་མ་ཡིན་ཞེས་སྨྲས་ཚེ་རྒྱུན་མ་ཤེས་པས་རྒྱུན་མ་ངོས་ཟིན་པ་དང་ཅིག་ཤོས་ཀྱིས་ངོས་མ་ཟིན་པར་འཛོག་པ་བཞིན་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

because the *Buddhapālita Commentary* says:[a]

> Moreover, for example, at the time of dispute two witnesses testify with regard to what is the true fact. Between them, one directly saw the fact, but the other did not directly see the fact, and is mistaken,[b] or is on the side of a friend.[c] When both of them are also made to speak with regard to this, the latter has spoken the fact as it is in truth, but because the fact was not even directly [seen, the latter's testimony] is false and also endowed with impropriety and ill repute. When the other one speaks the fact, then because the fact was directly [seen], it is a true statement and endowed with propriety and repute.
>
> Likewise, although it is a fact that all phenomena are empty and because of being empty are not produced and not ceased, those [that is, the Proponents of the Middle Way] who have knowledge by direct perception of it [that is, emptiness,] are endowed with goodness and are praised, but because the other [that is, the Diverged Afars] do not directly [see] emptiness, they are polluted by defects of view and derided by the wise. Hence, these two are very different.[d]

---

[a] Without Christian Lindtner's translation, I could not have understood this part. See Lindtner, "Buddhapālita on Emptiness," 206-207.

[b] What the mistake is is unclear; it might mean "to be bribed" as Lindtner speculates.

[c] In a similar context, *mdza'* in Chandrakīrti's *Clear Words* means friendly. See Chandrakīrti, *Clear Words,* 118a.3.

[d] The ellipsis in the Tibetan is supplemented with its contents from the *Buddhapālita Commentary* on Nāgārjuna's *Treatise of the Middle,* the chapter on Analysis of Self, XVIII.12 (sde dge 3842, *dbu ma,* vol. *tsha,* 243b.2-243b.6); also see Saito, "A Study of the Buddhapālita," 253-254; Christian Lindtner, "Buddhapālita on Emptiness," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 23, no. 3 (1981):196.

བུདྡྷ་པཱ་ལི་ཏ་ལས། །གཞན་ཡང་དཔེར་ན་ཁ་ཅིག་རྫོད་པ་ན་ ཞེས་པ་ནས། [དོན་བདེན་པར་འགྱུར་བ་ཀོ་ན་ལ་ཆེ་བཞི་གཉིས་སྟོན་པར་གྱུར་ལ། དེ་ན་གཅིག་ནི་དོན་དེ་མངོན་སུམ་དུ་མཐོང་བ་ཡིན་ལ་གཉིས་པ་ནི་དོན་དེ་མངོན་སུམ་དུ་མཐོང་བར་གྱུར་པ་མ་ཡིན་ཞིང་ནོར་ངོའམ་མཛའ་ངོས་གཉེར་བ་ཞིག་ཡིན་ཏེ། དེ་གཉི་ག་ཡང་དོན་དེ་ལ་སྨྲར་བཙུག་པ་ན། དེ་ལ་གཅིག་གིས་དོན་དེ་ཇི་ལྟར་བདེན་པ་དེ་ལྟར་སྨྲས་སུ་ཟིན་ཀྱང་དོན་དེ་མངོན་སུམ་དུ་ཡང་མ་གྱུར་པའི་ཕྱིར་བརྫུན་དུ་ཡང་འགྱུར་ལ་ཆོས་མ་ཡིན་པ་དང་མི་སྙན་པ་དང་ཡང་ལྡན་པར་འགྱུར་རོ། །ཅིག་ཤོས་ཀྱིས་ནི་དོན་དེ་སྨྲས་པ་ན་དོན་དེ་མངོན་སུམ་དུ་གྱུར་པའི་ཕྱིར་བདེན་པར་སྨྲ་བ་ཡང་ཡིན་ལ་ཆོས་དང་སྙན་པ་དག་དང་ཡང་ལྡན་པར་འགྱུར་བ་]དེ་བཞིན་དུ། དངོས་པོ་ཐམས་ཅད་སྟོང་ཉིད་ཡིན་ཞིང་སྟོང་པའི་ཕྱིར་མ་སྐྱེས་པ་དང་མ་འགགས་པ་དེ་ཡིན་དུ་ཟིན་ཀྱང་དེ་ལ་གང་ལ་མངོན་སུམ་གྱིས་ཤེས་པ་ཡོད་པ་དེ་ཉིད་ལེགས་པ་དང་ལྡན་ཞིང་བསྔགས་པ་ཡིན་གྱི། ཅིག་ཤོས་ནི་སྟོང་ཉིད་མངོན་སུམ་དུ་མ་གྱུར་པའི་ཕྱིར། ལྟ་བའི་སྐྱོན་གྱིས་ཀྱང་གོས་ལ་མཁས་པ་རྣམས་ཀྱིས་སྨད་པར་ཡང་འགྱུར་བས། དེའི་ཕྱིར་དེ་གཉིས་ནི་ཁྱད་པར་ཤིན་ཏུ་ཆེ་སྟེ་ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

[This] entails [that it is like, for example, that when both someone who identified a man as a robber and another who did not identify such say "He is the robber," it is posited that the one who knew the robber identified the robber and the other one did not identify the robber] because the meaning of [his] statement "they are polluted by defects of view" exists, and because Chandrakīrti's *Clear Words* also says:

> [*Objection:*] They are the same [in holding] that things are [not established].[a]

[a] The bracketed material here is inserted according to Chandrakīrti's *Clear Words*. See Chandrakīrti, *dbu ma rtsa ba'i 'grel pa tshig gsal ba,* in bstan 'gyur (*sde dge*), TBRC W23703.102 (Delhi: Delhi Karmapae Choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 118a.2. This part is missing in Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Decisive Analysis,* 183a.6. I have confirmed that this is also missing in the 1997 Mundgod Revision of Ngawang Gelek *bla*

> [*Answer:*] Even if they are just similar in holding that things are [not established], they are just dissimilar because the realizers are different. It is as follows: For example, with regard to a man who has committed robbery,[a] without correctly knowing [who the robber is], one, having been incited by disliking him, wrongly says, "This man stole", but another, actually seeing [the robbery], does identify [that this man is the robber].[b]

[དེ་ཡིན་ན་དཔེར་ན་མི་རྐུན་མར་ངོ་ཤེས་མ་ཤེས་གཉིས་ཀས་འདི་རྐུན་མ་ཡིན་ཞེས་སྨྲས་ཆེ་རྐུན་མ་ཤེས་པས་རྐུན་མ་ངོས་ཟིན་པ་དང་ཅིག་ཤོས་ཀྱིས་ངོས་མ་ཟིན་པར་འཇོག་པ་བཞིན་ཡིན་པས་]ཁྲབ་སྟེ། ལྟ་བའི་སྐྱོན་གྱིས་ཀྱང་གོས་ལ་ཞེས་པའི་དོན་ཡོད་པའི་ཕྱིར་དང་། ཚིག་གསལ་ལས་ཀྱང་། གལ་ཏེ་དངོས་པོ་[མ་གྲུབ་པ་]མཚུངས་སོ་ཞེས་ན་གལ་ཏེ་ཡང་དངོས་པོ་མ་གྲུབ་པ་མཚུངས་[183b]པ་ཉིད་ཡིན་པ་དེ་ལྟ་[ན་]ཡང་རྟོགས་པ་པོ་ཐ་དད་པས་མི་མཚུངས་པ་ཉིད་དོ། །འདི་ལྟ་སྟེ། དཔེར་ན་རྐུས་བྱས་པའི་མི་ཞིག་ལ། [གཅིག་གིས་ནི་ཡང་དག་པར་མི་ཤེས་བཞིན་དུ་དེ་དང་མི་མཛའ་བས་སྦྱད་ནས་འདིས་བརྐུས་སོ་ཞེས་དེ་ལ་ལོག་པར་སྨྲ་བར་བྱེད་ལ། གཞན་ནི་དངོས་སུ་མཐོང་ནས་སུན་འབྱིན་པར་བྱེད་དོ།] ཞེས་སོགས་གསུངས་པའི་

---

brang edition, 183a.6, and the 2004 Beijing edition, 187.

The corresponding passage in Sanskrit is:

> *vastutastulyate iti cet// yathyāpi vastuo'siddhistulyā tathāpi pratipattṛbhedādatulyatā/ yathā hi kṛtacauryaṃ puruṣamekhaḥ samyagaparijñāyaiva tadamitrapreritastaṃ mithyā vyācaṣṭe cauryamanena kṛtamiti/ bhedastathāpi parijñātṛbhedādekastatra mṛṣābādityudyate/ aparastu satyavādīti, ekaścāyaśasā cāpuṇyena ca samyak parīkṣyamāṇo yujyate nāparaḥ/*

See Poussin, *Prasannapadā Commentaire de Candrakīrti,* 368.16-369.3.

[a] In the *sde ge* edition of Chandrakīrti's *Clear Words, rkus byas pa* reads *rku byas pa;* however, the three editions of Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Decisive Analysis* that are consulted here read *rkus byas pa*. See Candrakīrti, *dbu ma rtsa ba'i 'grel pa tshig gsal ba,* 118a.3; the 2007 Mundgod edition, 250; the 2004 Beijing edition, 187; the 1997 Mundgod Revision of Ngawang Gelek *bla brang* edition, 183b.1.

[b] From "without" to the end of the sentence is a filling in of an ellipsis; Chandrakīrti, *dbu ma rtsa ba'i 'grel pa tshig gsal ba,* in bstan 'gyur (*sde dge*), TBRC W23703.102 (Delhi: Delhi Karmapae Choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 118a.2-118a.3.

ཕྱིར།

4. Someone says: It follows that the view in the [mental] continuum of a Diverged Afar[a] (*rgyang phan, ayata*) that former and later births are natureless is the Middle Way view because the naturelessness of former and later births is the final mode of subsistence.

ཁོ་ན་རེ། རྒྱང་ཕན་རྒྱུད་ཀྱི་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་ལྟ་བ་དབུ་མའི་ལྟ་བ་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་གནས་ལུགས་མཐར་ཐུག་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: [That the naturelessness of former and later births is the final mode of subsistence] does not entail [that the view in the Diverged Afars' mental continuum that former and later births are natureless is the Middle Way view]. Well then, it [absurdly] follows that the view in the [mental] continuum of a Proponent of the Great Exposition that a [Buddha's] enjoyment body (*longs sku, saṃbhogakāya*) is natureless is the Middle Way view because the naturelessness of an enjoyment body is the final mode of subsistence.

[སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་གནས་ལུགས་མཐར་ཐུག་ཡིན་ན་རྒྱང་ཕན་རྒྱུད་ཀྱི་སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་ལྟ་བ་དབུ་མའི་ལྟ་བ་ཡིན་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ། འོ་ན་བྱེ་སྨྲའི་རྒྱུད་ཀྱི་ལོངས་སྐུ་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་ལྟ་བ་དབུ་མའི་ལྟ་བ་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། ལོངས་སྐུ་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་གནས་ལུགས་མཐར་ཐུག་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

[You have asserted] the three spheres [of self-contradiction].[b]

---

[a] Nihilist.

[b] In brief, in general, the three spheres are composed of three elements: the opponent's assertion of the reason (*rtags khas langs pa*), the opponent's assertion of the entailment (*khyab pa khas langs pa*), and the opponent's assertion of the opposite of "thesis" of the consequence (*bsal ba'i bzlog phyogs khas langs pa*). Since the opponent has asserted or is forced to assert the reason and the entailment, the opponent has to accept the consequence; however, if the opponent also asserts or is forced to assert the opposite of the consequence, then the opponent is caught in a self-contradiction. For a lengthy discussion of the three spheres, see Jongbok Yi, "Monastic Pedagogy on Emptiness in the Geluk Sect of Tibetan Buddhism: Intellectual History and Analysis of Topics Concerning Ignorance According

འཁོར་གསུམ།

Likewise, know how to apply [this mode of refutation] to the Mind-Only Proponents' view that the imputational nature is not established by way of its own character.

དེ་བཞིན་དུ་སེམས་ཙམ་པའི་ཀུན་བཏགས་རང་གི་མཚན་ཉིད་ཀྱིས་མ་གྲུབ་པར་ལྟ་བ་སོགས་ལ་སྦྱོར་ཤེས་པར་བྱ།

5. *Moreover, someone says:* It follows that such a view in the Diverged Afars' [mental] continuum [that former and later births are natureless] is a factually concordant conceptual consciousness (*rtog pa don mthun*) because of the previous reason [which is that the naturelessness of former and later births is the final mode of subsistence].

ཡང་ཁོ་ན་རེ། རྒྱང་ཕན་རྒྱུད་ཀྱི་[སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་]དེ་འདྲ་[བའི་ལྟ་བ་]དེ་རྟོག་པ་དོན་མཐུན་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། རྟགས་སྔར་གྱི་[སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་གནས་ལུགས་མཐར་ཐུག་ཡིན་པ་]དེའི་ཕྱིར་ན་ཡང་

Our response: [That the naturelessness of former and later births is the final mode of subsistence] does not entail [that such a view in the Diverged Afars' continuum that former and later births are natureless is a factually concordant conceptual consciousness].

[སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་གནས་ལུགས་མཐར་ཐུག་ཡིན་ན་རྒྱང་ཕན་རྒྱུད་ཀྱི་(སྐྱེ་བ་སྔ་ཕྱི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་)དེ་འདྲ་(བའི་ལྟ་བ་)དེ་རྟོག་པ་དོན་མཐུན་ཡིན་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ།

Well then, it [absurdly] follows that the view in the [mental] continuum of a Proponent of the Great Exposition that a [Buddha's] enjoyment body is such [that is, natureless] is a factually concordant conceptual consciousness; the reason is as before, [that is, because the naturelessness of an enjoyment body is the final mode of subsistence].

འོ་ན་བྱེ་སྨྲའི་རྒྱུད་ཀྱི་ལོངས་སྐུ་[རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་]དེ་ལྟར་ལྟ་བ་དེ་

to Svātantrika-Mādhyamika in Monastic Textbooks by Jamyang Shaypa" (Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 2013), Chapter 5.

རྟོག་པ་དོན་མཐུན་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། [ཡོངས་སྐྱ་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་གནས་ལུགས་མཐར་ཐུག་ཡིན་པའི་]རྟགས་སྔར་བཞིན།

[You have asserted] the three spheres [of self-contradiction].
འཁོར་གསུམ།

6. Moreover, Go-bo [Go-ram-pa Sö-nam-seng-ge][a] ***says:*** It follows that the statement by the Foremost Precious [Tsong-kha-pa]:[b]

> [When, in that way, you have identified well the apprehension of true existence, you will understand that there are many apprehensions that are not the two apprehensions of self, whereby] all wrong ideas asserting that reasonings analyzing suchness refute all objects apprehended by conceptuality will be overcome.

is not logically feasible; [for] the thought of the Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras is to be explained as being that howsoever forms are apprehended—as the four extremes of being empty[c] or not empty or as the middle free from them—are apprehensions of extremes and hence must be refuted, and

---

[a] *go rams pa bsod nams seng ge,* 1429-1489.

[b] This passage, which has been expanded to provide more context, appears to be from Go-ram-pa's summary of Tsong-kha-pa's position in the former's *Distinguishing the Views [of Emptiness]: Moonlight [To Illuminate] the Main Points of the Supreme Vehicle* (*lta ba'i shan 'byed theg mchog gnad kyi zla zer*) where he says:

> Hence, the mind that understands reality is the apprehension of emptiness alone—that is, of the emptiness of truth [that is arrived at] after having negated truth. If one properly identifies [what it means] to apprehend [things] as true (*bden 'dzin*), one will come to understand that there are many conceptual thoughts that are neither of the two forms of the grasping at truth [of self and phenomena]. This counteracts all of the mistaken views (*log rtog*) that believe that every object that is apprehended by a conceptual thought is negated by means of the reasoning that analyzes reality.
> དེ་ལྟར་བདེན་འཛིན་ལེགས་པར་ངོས་ཟིན་ན་བདེན་འཛིན་གཉིས་མིན་པའི་རྟོག་པ་དུ་མ་ཞིག་ཡོད་པར་ཤེས་པར་འགྱུར་བས། རྟོག་པས་གང་བཟུང་གི་ཡུལ་ཐམས་ཅད་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་ལ་དཔྱོད་པའི་རིགས་པས་དགག་པར་འདོད་པའི་ལོག་རྟོག་ཐམས་ཅད་ཟློག་པར་འགྱུར་རོ།།

The translation is from José Ignacio Cabezón and Geshe Lozang Dargyay, *Freedom from Extremes: Gorampa's 'Distinguishing the Views' and the Polemics of Emptiness Studies in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism* (Boston, MA.: Wisdom Publications, 2007), 82-83.

[c] The four extremes (*mtha' bzhi*) are, for instance, forms are empty, not empty, both empty and not empty, and neither empty nor not empty.

[thus] it is not logically feasible that you [Tsong-kha-pa,] having solely refuted truth [that is, true establishment (*bden par grub pa*),] assert that [forms] abide in the middle.

ཡང་གོ་བོ་ན་རེ། རྗེ་རིན་པོ་ཆེས་རྟོག་པས་གང་བཟུང་གི་ཡུལ་ཐམས་ཅད་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་ལ་དཔྱོད་པའི་རིགས་པས་འགོག་པར་འདོད་པའི་ལོག་རྟོག་ཐམས་ཅད་ལྡོག་[251]པར་འགྱུར་རོ་གསུངས་པ་མི་འཐད་པར་ཐལ། ཤེར་ཕྱིན་གྱི་མདོའི་དགོངས་པ་གཟུགས་སྟོང་མི་སྟོང་མཐའ་བཞི་དང་། དེ་དག་བྲལ་བའི་དབུས་གང་དུ་བློས་བཟུང་བ་མཐར་འཛིན་ཡིན་པས་དགག་དགོས་པར་བཤད་ལ་ཁྱེད་རང་བདེན་པ་འབའ་ཞིག་བཀག་ནས་དབུས་ལ་གནས་པར་འདོད་པ་མི་འཐད་ཟེར་ན།

Our response: Well then, it [absurdly] follows that the distinction that reasoning analyzing the ultimate refutes inherent existence but does not refute forms and so forth that are illusory-like dependent-arisings is not to be made because [according to you] that reasoning refutes all whatsoever objects. You have accepted the reason [which is that reasoning refutes all whatsoever objects].

འོ་ན་དོན་[184a]དམ་དཔྱོད་བྱེད་ཀྱི་རིགས་པས་རང་བཞིན་འགོག་ལ་རྟེན་འབྱུང་སྒྱུ་མ་ལྟ་བུའི་གཟུགས་སོགས་མི་འགོག་པའི་ཁྱད་པར་མི་ཕྱེད་པར་ཐལ། རིགས་པ་དེས་ཡུལ་གང་ཡིན་ཐམས་ཅད་འགོག་པའི་ཕྱིར། [རིགས་པ་དེས་ཡུལ་གང་ཡིན་ཐམས་ཅད་འགོག་པར་]རྟགས་ཁས། །

If you [Go-ram-pa] accept [that the distinction that reasoning analyzing the ultimate refutes inherent existence but does not refute forms and so forth that are illusory-like dependent-arisings is not to be made,] you contradict many sūtras and treatises such as Chandrakīrti's *Clear Words* which says:

> We are not propounding that "Action, doer, effect, and so forth do

> not exist."
> Why?
> We posit that inherent existence does not exist.

[དོན་དམ་དཔྱོད་བྱེད་ཀྱི་རིགས་པས་རང་བཞིན་འགོག་ལ་རྗེན་འབྱུང་སྒྲུ་མ་ལྟ་བུའི་གཟུགས་སོགས་མི་འགོག་པའི་ཁྱད་པར་མི་ཕྱེད་པར་]འདོད་ན། ཚིག་གསལ་ལས། ཁོ་བོ་ཅག་ནི་ལས་དང་བྱེད་པ་པོ་དང་འབྲས་བུ་ལ་སོགས་པ་མེད་དོ་ཞེས་སྨྲ་བ་མ་ཡིན་ཏེ། འོ་ན་ཅི་ཞེ་ན་རང་བཞིན་མེད་དོ་ཞེས་རྣམ་པར་འཇོག་པ་ཡིན་ནོ་ཞེས་གསུངས་པ་སོགས་མདོ་དང་བསྟན་བཅོས་དུ་མ་དང་འགལ་བར་འགྱུར་རོ།

7. Moreover, with respect to the statements in Tsong-kha-pa's "Explanation [of (Chandrakīrti's) 'Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) Treatise on the Middle'"] and so forth that refutation of objects imputed only by Forders and Proponents of Tenets does not harm the apprehension of inherent existence that has operated beginninglessly,*[a] *the Translator

[a] It appears that Jam-yang-shay-pa summarizes Tsong-kha-pa's introduction to the object of negation in his *Illumination of the Thought* (see above, 43) :

> With regard to delineating the absence of true existence in phenomena, if you do not understand well just what true establishment is, as well as how [phenomena] are apprehended as truly existent, the view of suchness will definitely go astray. Shāntideva's *Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds* says that if the thing imputed, the generality [or image] of the object of negation, does not appear well to your awareness, it is impossible to apprehend well the nonexistence of the object of negation:
>
> > Without making contact with the thing imputed,
> > The nonexistence of that thing is not apprehended.
>
> Therefore, unless true establishment (which is what does not exist) and the aspect of the object of negation (which is that of which [phenomena] are empty) do not appear—just as they are—as objects of [your] awareness, good ascertainment of the lack of true establishment and of the entity of emptiness cannot occur.
>
> Furthermore, mere identification of (1) a true establishment that is superficially imputed by proponents of tenets and (2) [the consciousness] apprehending such true establishment is not sufficient. Because of this, it is most essential to identify well the innate apprehension of true establishment that has operated beginninglessly and exists both in those whose awarenesses have been affected through [study of] tenets and in those whose awarenesses have not been affected in this way, and to identify the true establishment apprehended by this [mind].

Tag-tshang says: This is not logically feasible because even among innate awarenesses there are apprehensions of permanence and of former and later [phenomena] as one.

ཡང་རྣམ་བཤད་སོགས་ལས་མུ་སྟེགས་པ་དང་གྲུབ་མཐའ་སྨྲ་བ་ཁོ་ནས་བཏགས་པའི་ཡུལ་བཀག་པས་ཐོགས་མེད་ནས་ཞུགས་པའི་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཀྱི་བདེན་འཛིན་ལ་མི་གནོད་གསུངས་པ་ལ། སྟག་ཚང་པ་ན་རེ། [མུ་སྟེགས་པ་དང་གྲུབ་མཐའ་སྨྲ་བ་ཁོ་ནས་བཏགས་པའི་ཡུལ་བཀག་པས་ཐོགས་མེད་ནས་ཞུགས་པའི་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཀྱི་བདེན་འཛིན་ལ་མི་གནོད་པ་]དེ་མི་འཐད་པར་ཐལ། ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཀྱི་བློ་ལའང་རྟག་འཛིན་དང་སྔ་ཕྱི་གཅིག་འཛིན་ཡོད་པའི་ཕྱིར་ཟེར་ན་

Our response: [If even among innate awarenesses there are apprehensions of permanence and of former and later (phenomena) as one,] it is not entailed [that it is not logically feasible that refutation of objects imputed only by Forders and Proponents of Tenets does not harm the apprehension of inherent existence that has operated beginninglessly,] because there is something eliminated by "only" [in "imputed only by Forders and Proponents of Tenets"]. Well, for him, it [absurdly] follows that whatever is an apprehension of permanence is necessarily an apprehension in accordance with the Forders' superimposition that the self is permanent because [according to him] an innate apprehension of permanence apprehends in that way [that is to say, in accordance with the Forders' superimposition that the self is permanent]. You have accepted the reason [which is that an innate apprehension of permanence apprehends in that way, that is to say, in accordance with the Forders' superimposition that the self is permanent].

[ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཀྱི་བློ་ལའང་རྟག་འཛིན་དང་སྔ་ཕྱི་གཅིག་འཛིན་ཡོད་ན། མུ་སྟེགས་པ་དང་གྲུབ་མཐའ་སྨྲ་བ་ཁོ་ནས་བཏགས་པའི་ཡུལ་བཀག་པས་ཐོགས་མེད་ནས་ཞུགས་པའི་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཀྱི་བདེན་འཛིན་ལ་མི་གནོད་པ་དེ་མི་འཐད་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ་སྟེ། [མུ་སྟེགས་

For if you have not identified these, even if you refute an object of negation through reasoning, the adherence to true establishment that has operated beginninglessly is not harmed at all, due to which the meaning at this point would be lost.

See Hopkins, *Tsong-kha-pa's Final Exposition of Wisdom,* 186.

པ་དང་གྲུབ་མཐའ་སྨྲ་བ་]ཁོ་ན་ཞེས་པའི་[ཁོ་ནའི་]རྣམ་བཅད་ཡོད་པའི་ཕྱིར། ཁོ་རང་ལ་འོ་ན་རྟག་འཛིན་ཡིན་ན་དེའི་ཡུལ་མུ་སྟེགས་པས་བདག་རྟག་པར་སྒྲོ་བཏགས་པ་ལྟར་བཟུང་བས་ཁྱབ་པར་ཐལ། ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཀྱི་རྟག་འཛིན་གྱིས་[མུ་སྟེགས་པས་བདག་རྟག་པར་སྒྲོ་བཏགས་པ་]དེ་ལྟར་བཟུང་བའི་ཕྱིར། [ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཀྱི་རྟག་འཛིན་གྱིས་མུ་སྟེགས་པས་བདག་རྟག་པར་སྒྲོ་བཏགས་པ་དེ་ལྟར་བཟུང་བར་]རྟགས་ཁས།

If you accept [that whatever is an apprehension of permanence is necessarily an apprehension in accordance with the Forders' superimposition that the self is permanent], it [absurdly] follows that in the continuums of those who are not involved in tenet systems such as animals and so forth, there is apprehension that the self is permanent in the sense of not being produced from causes and conditions because [in the continuums of those who are not involved in tenet systems such as animals and so forth,] there is apprehension that the self is permanent in the sense of not disintegrating until death. The reason [which is that in the continuums of those who are not involved in tenet systems such as animals and so forth there is apprehension that the self is permanent in the sense of not disintegrating until death,] is easy [to establish].

[རྟག་འཛིན་ཡིན་ན་དེའི་ཡུལ་མུ་སྟེགས་པས་བདག་རྟག་པར་སྒྲོ་བཏགས་པ་ལྟར་བཟུང་བས་ཁྱབ་པར་]འདོད་ན། དུད་འགྲོ་སོགས་གྲུབ་མཐར་མ་ཞུགས་པའི་རྒྱུད་ལ་བདག་རྒྱུ་རྐྱེན་གང་ལས་མ་སྐྱེས་པའི་རྟག་འཛིན་ཡོད་པར་ཐལ། [དུད་འགྲོ་སོགས་གྲུབ་མཐར་མ་ཞུགས་པའི་རྒྱུད་ལ་]བདག་མ་ཤི་བར་དུ་མི་འཇིག་པའི་རྟག་འཛིན་ཡོད་པའི་ཕྱིར། [དུད་འགྲོ་སོགས་གྲུབ་མཐར་མ་ཞུགས་པའི་རྒྱུད་ལ་བདག་མ་ཤི་བར་དུ་མི་འཇིག་པའི་རྟག་འཛིན་ཡོད་པར་]རྟགས་སླ།

If you accept [that in the continuum of animals not engaged in tenet systems, there is apprehension that the self is permanent in the sense of not being produced from causes and conditions], it [absurdly] follows that it is not logically feasible for Chandrakīrti's root text [*Supplement to*

(Nāgārjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle"] to say:[a]

> This nonproduced permanent [self imputed by Forders] is not
> perceived
> By those spending many eons as animals,
> [Yet consciousnesses conceiving "I" are seen to operate in them.
> Hence, there is no self other than the aggregates].

[དུད་འགྲོ་སོགས་གྲུབ་མཐར་མ་ཞུགས་པའི་རྒྱུད་ལ་བདག་རྒྱུ་རྐྱེན་གང་ལས་མ་སྐྱེས་པའི་རྟག་འཛིན་ཡོད་པར་]འདོད་ན། ཚ་བར། གང་དག་དུད་འགྲོར་བསྐལ་མང་[184b]བསྐྱལ་གྱུར་པ། །དེས་ཀྱང་མ་སྐྱེས་རྟག་འདི་མ་མཐོང་ལ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པ་མི་འཐད་པར་ཐལ་ལོ། །

Moreover, it [absurdly] follows that although the Proponents of the Great Exposition and the Proponents of Sūtra and so forth have not entered the Middle [view], they can harm the conceived object of the apprehension of true existence because [according to you] your [damaging] thesis [that it is not logically feasible that refutation of objects imputed only by Forders and Proponents of Tenets does not harm the apprehension of inherent existence that has operated beginninglessly] is logically feasible.[b]

གཞན་ཡང་བྱེ་མདོ་སོགས་ཀྱིས་དབུ་མར་མ་ཞུགས་ཀྱང་བདེན་འཛིན་གྱི་ཞེན་ཡུལ་ལ་གནོད་པ་ཐུབ་པར་ཐལ། [མུ་སྟེགས་པ་དང་གྲུབ་མཐའ་སྨྲ་བ་པོ་ནས་བཏགས་པའི་ཡུལ་བཀག་པས་ཐོག་མེད་ནས་ཞུགས་པའི་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཀྱི་བདེན་འཛིན་ལ་མི་གནོད་པ་དེ་མི་འཐད་པ་(ཅིང་། གནོད་)འི་]དམ་

---

[a] VI.125. See Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound,* 648. The citation is lengthened in order to provide more context. In Tibetan it is:

> གང་དག་དུད་འགྲོ་བསྐལ་མང་བརྒྱལ་གྱུར་པ། །
> དེས་ཀྱང་མ་སྐྱེས་རྟག་འདི་མ་མཐོང་ལ། །
> ངར་འཛིན་དེ་དག་ལ་ཡང་འཇུག་མཐོང་སྟེ། །
> དེས་ན་ཕུང་པོ་ལས་གཞན་བདག་འགའ་མེད། །

See Chandrakīrti, *dbu ma la 'jug pa,* 210a.7-210b.1.

[b] The opponent's thesis was that Tsong-kha-pa's statement—"Refutation of objects imputed only by Forders and Proponents of Tenets does not harm the apprehension of inherent existence that has operated beginninglessly"—is not logically feasible.

བཅའ་འཐད་པའི་ཕྱིར།

It is easy to negate Tibetans whose object of negation is too broad such as Shang Thang-sag-pa [Shön-nu-gyal-tshan)[a]] and those whose object of negation is too narrow. These [points made here] explain the main thought and not just the explicit reading of Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'."*

བོད་ཀྱི་དགག་བྱ་ཁྱབ་ཆེ་བ་ཐང་སག་པ་དག་དང་ཁྱབ་ཆུང་བ་དགག་སླ། འདི་དག་ནི་རྣམ་བཤད་ཀྱི་དངོས་ཟིན་ཙམ་མ་ཡིན་པར་དགོངས་པའི་གཙོ་བོ་བཤད་པ་ཡིན་ནོ། །

8. Moreover, someone in an earlier period posited: There are two objects of negation by correct reasoning (*rigs pa yang dag gi dgag bya*)—existent and nonexistent. ***And asserted:*** Object of negation by a correct reasoning (*rigs pa yang dag gi dgag bya*) and object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum of a correct sign (*rtags yang dag gi bsgrub bya'i bzlog zlar gyur pa'i dgag bya*) are equivalent.

ཡང་སྔོན་གྱི་ཁ་ཅིག་ན་[252]རེ། རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ལ་ཡོད་མེད་གཉིས་འཇོག་ལ། རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་དང་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླར་གྱུར་པའི་དགག་བྱ་དོན་གཅིག་པར་འདོད།

With regard to this, another early scholar said:

> If somebody said to me, "It follows that the subject, the apprehension of true existence, is not an object of negation by a correct sign proving [something] as not truly existent because of being a probandum of a correct sign," I would say "[Whatever is a probandum of a correct sign] is not necessarily [an object of negation by a correct sign proving the absence of true establishment]."

དེ་ལ་སྔོན་གྱི་གཞན་དག་ན་རེ། བདེན་འཛིན་ཆོས་ཅན། བདེན་མེད་དུ་སྒྲུབ་པའི་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་མ་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ།

[a] *zhang thang sag pa gzhon nu rgyal mtshan.*

རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་[རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱ་ཡིན་ན་བདེན་མེད་དུ་སྒྲུབ་པའི་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་མ་ཡིན་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ་ཟེར།

Our response: Well then, with regard to this, it [absurdly] follows that whatever is the predicate of the probandum in a proof of something is necessarily the probandum in the proof of that something because [according to you] the apprehension of true existence is the probandum of a correct sign. If you accept [that whatever is the predicate of the probandum in a proof of something is necessarily the probandum in the proof of that something,] it is very amazing.

དེ་ལ་འོ་ན་དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་ཆོས་ཡིན་ན་དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱ་ཡིན་དགོས་པར་ཐལ། བདེན་འཛིན་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་ཆོས་ཡིན་ན་དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱ་ཡིན་དགོས་པར་]འདོད་ན། ངོ་མཚར་ཆེ།

Also, with regard to the first thesis [that it is posited that there are two objects of negation by correct reasoning (*rigs pa yang dag gi dgag bya*)—existent and nonexistent and that object of negation by a correct reasoning (*rigs pa yang dag*) and object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum (*sgrub bya, sādhya*) proven by a correct sign (*rtags yang dag*) are equivalent,] it [absurdly] follows that the subject, the apprehension of true existence, is an object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum of a correct sign (*rtags yang dag*) because of being an object of negation by a correct reasoning (*rigs pa yang dag*). It follows that [the subject, the apprehension of true existence, is an object of negation by a correct reasoning] because of being the object of negation by a correct reasoning proving the absence of true existence.

ཡང་དམ་བཅའ་དང་པོ་[རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ལ་ཡོད་མེད་གཉིས་འཛོག་ལ། རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་དང་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླར་གྱུར་པའི་དགག་བྱ་དོན་གཅིག་པ་]ལ། བདེན་འཛིན་ཆོས་ཅན། རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླ་གྱུར་པའི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [བདེན་འཛིན་

ཆོས་ཅན་རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། བདེན་མེད་དུ་སྒྲུབ་པའི་རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

It follows [that the subject, an apprehension of true existence is an object of negation by correct reasoning (*rigs pa yang dag*) proving the absence of true existence] because of being an object of negation by a correct logicality (*'thad pa yang dag*) proving that [absence of true existence]. Whatever is an object of negation by a correct logicality (*'thad pa yang dag*) proving the absence of true existence] is necessarily [an object of negation by correct reasoning (*rigs pa yang dag*) proving the absence of true existence] because reasoning (*rigs pa*) and logicality (*'thad pa*) are equivalent.

[བདེན་འཛིན་ཆོས་ཅན་བདེན་མེད་དུ་སྒྲུབ་པའི་རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། [བདེན་མེད་]དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་འཐད་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [བདེན་མེད་དུ་སྒྲུབ་པའི་འཐད་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་ན་བདེན་མེད་དུ་སྒྲུབ་པའི་རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པས་]ཁྱབ་སྟེ། རིགས་པ་དང་འཐད་[185a]པ་དོན་གཅིག་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

At the point of the statement of no entailment [that is, whatever is an object of negation by a correct logicality (*'thad pa yang dag*) proving the absence of true existence] is necessarily [an object of negation by correct reasoning (*rigs pa yang dag*) proving the absence of true existence,] the sign [that is, that the apprehension of true existence is an object of negation by a correct logicality proving the absence of true existence ([*bden med*] *de sgrub kyi 'thad pa yang dag gi dgag bya yin pa*)] is established because since that [apprehension of true existence] is not logically feasible in accordance with its apprehension, that [apprehension of true existence] comes to be an object of negation by a correct logicality.

[བདེན་མེད་དུ་སྒྲུབ་པའི་འཐད་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་ན་བདེན་མེད་དུ་སྒྲུབ་པའི་རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ་མཚམས་ཀྱི་[བདེན་འཛིན་(བདེན་མེད་)དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་འཐད་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པ་]རྟགས་

ཁྱབ་སྟེ། [བདེན་འཛིན་]དེས་བཟུང་བ་ལྟར་མི་འཐད་པས་[བདེན་འཛིན་]དེ་འཐད་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱར་སོང་བའི་ཕྱིར།

It follows [that since that (apprehension of true existence) is not logically feasible in accordance with its apprehension, that [apprehension of true existence] comes to be an object of negation by a correct logicality,] because for that reason both an apprehension of true existence as well as [its] conceived object [that is, true establishment] must be posited as objects of negation by [a correct logicality] because Nāgārjuna's *Refutation of Objections* says:

> Or, someone's wrong apprehension thinking
> That a magically emanated woman is a [real] woman
> Is negated by [another] magical emanation.
> This [apprehension of true existence] is like that [that is, is refuted by words that are like illusions].

That a man's apprehension of a magically emanated woman as a real woman is negated by [another] magical emanation is indicated by the first three lines, and "This is like that" explains that words like an emanation overcome the apprehension of inherent existence.

[བདེན་འཛིན་དེས་བཟུང་བ་ལྟར་མི་འཐད་པས་བདེན་འཛིན་དེ་འཐད་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱར་སོང་བ་]དེར་ཐལ། དེའི་རྒྱུ་མཚན་གྱིས་[འཐད་པ་ཡང་དག་]དེའི་དགག་བྱ་ལ་བདེན་འཛིན་ཞེན་ཡུལ་དང་བཅས་པ་གཉིས་ཀ་འཇོག་དགོས་པའི་ཕྱིར། རྩོད་ཟློག་ལས། ཡང་ན་ཁ་ཅིག་སྤྲུལ་པ་ཡི། །བུད་མེད་ལ་ནི་བུད་མེད་སྙམ། །ལོག་འཛིན་འབྱུང་བ་སྤྲུལ་པ་ཡིས། །འགོག་བྱེད་འདི་ནི་དེ་ལྟ་ཡིན། །ཞེས་མི་ཁ་ཅིག་གིས་སྤྲུལ་པའི་བུད་མེད་བུད་མེད་དངོས་གནས་སུ་འཛིན་པ་སྤྲུལ་པས་འགོག་པ་ནི། འགོག་བྱེད་ཅེས་པ་ཡན་ཆད་ཀྱིས་སྟོན་ལ། འདི་ནི་དེ་ལྟ་ཡིན་ཞེས་པས་ཚིག་སྤྲུལ་པ་ལྟ་བུས་རང་བཞིན་ཡོད་འཛིན་ཟློག་པར་བཤད་པའི་ཕྱིར་རོ།

If you accept the root [consequence that the apprehension of true existence is an object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum of a correct sign,] it [absurdly] follows that the subject, [the apprehension of true existence,] does not exist because of being an object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum of a correct sign. You have accepted the reason [which is that the apprehension of true existence is an object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum of a correct sign].

རྩ་བ་[བདེན་འཛིན་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླ་གྱུར་པའི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པ]ར་འདོད་ན། [བདེན་འཛིན་]དེ་ཆོས་ཅན། མེད་པར་ཐལ། རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླར་གྱུར་པའི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [བདེན་འཛིན་དེ་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླར་གྱུར་པའི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པ་]རྟགས་ཁས།

If [you say that being an object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum of a correct sign] does not entail [being nonexistent], it [absurdly] follows that a correct sign cannot prove a probandum proving something because the object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum proving something exists. You have accepted the reason [which is that the object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum proving something exists].

It is entailed [that if the object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum proving something exists, a correct sign cannot prove a probandum proving something] because if that [object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum proving something] exists, such [an object of negation] cannot be negated because Tsong-kha-pa's *Stages of the Path* says:[a]

> These also are, for instance, refutations of inherent existence—that is to say, establishment from [the object's] own side—with respect to persons and phenomena by the sign of dependent-arising. This object of negation is necessarily something that does not

[a] Tsong kha pa, *The Great Exposition of Stages of the Path (byang chub lam rim chen mo),* in *gsung 'bum/_tsong kha pa* (*bkras lhun par rnying / d+ha sar bskyar par brgyab pa/*), TBRC W29193.13 (Dharamsala, India: she rig par khang, 1997), 420a.3-420a.4. See also the translation in Tsong-kha-pa, *The Great Treatise on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment: Volume Three,* tr. the Lamrim Chenmo Translation Committee, ed. Joshua W. C. Cutler and Guy Newland, vol. 3 (Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Publications, 2002), 204.

exist among objects of knowledge because whatever exists cannot be refuted.

[རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླར་གྱུར་པའི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་ན་མེད་ཡིན་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ་ན། རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གིས་དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱ་སྒྲུབ་མི་ཐུབ་པར་ཐལ། དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླ་དགག་བྱ་ཡོད་པའི་ཕྱིར། [དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླ་དགག་བྱ་ཡོད་པ་]རྟགས་ཁས། [དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླ་དགག་བྱ་ཡོད་ན་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གིས་དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱ་སྒྲུབ་མི་ཐུབ་པས་]ཁྱབ་སྟེ། [དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླ་དགག་བྱ་]དེ་ཡོད་ན་དེ་ལྟར་དགག་མི་ནུས་པའི་ཕྱིར། ལམ་རིམ་ལས། འདི་ཡང་རྟེན་འབྲེལ་གྱི་རྟགས་ཀྱིས་གང་ཟག་དང་ཆོས་ཀྱི་སྟེང་དུ་[253]རང་གི་ངོས་ནས་གྲུབ་པའི་རང་བཞིན་ཡོད་པ་འགོག་པ་ལྟ་བུ་རྣམས་ཡིན་ནོ། །དགག་བྱ་འདི་ནི་ཤེས་བྱ་ལ་མེད་པ་གཅིག་དགོས་ཏེ། ཡོད་ན་དགག་པར་མི་ནུས་པའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །ཞེས་[185b]གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

9. With regard to that, someone says: It follows that there is no entailment that the object of negation that is the opposite of a probandum of a correct sign necessarily does not exist because nonexistence of sprout is the object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum of a correct sign proving that a sprout exists. It follows [that nonexistence of sprout is the object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum of a correct sign proving that a sprout exists] because that a sprout exists is the probandum in the proof of that.

བྱས་པ་ལ་ཁོ་ན་རེ། རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླ་དགག་བྱ་ལ་མེད་པས་མ་ཁྱབ་པར་ཐལ། མྱུ་གུ་མེད་པ་དེ་མྱུ་གུ་ཡོད་པར་སྒྲུབ་པའི་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླ་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [མྱུ་གུ་མེད་པ་དེ་མྱུ་གུ་ཡོད་པར་སྒྲུབ་པའི་རྟགས་

ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླ་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། མྱུ་གུ་ཡོད་པ་[མྱུ་གུ་ཡོད་པར་སྒྲུབ་པའི་]དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: [That that a sprout exists is the probandum in the proof of that] does not entail [that the nonexistence of a sprout is the object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum of a correct sign proving that a sprout exists] because that a sprout is nonexistent is posited as the opposite of the probandum in the proof [that a sprout exists].

[མྱུ་གུ་ཡོད་པ་མྱུ་གུ་ཡོད་པར་སྒྲུབ་པའི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱ་ཡིན་ན་མྱུ་གུ་མེད་པ་དེ་མྱུ་གུ་ཡོད་པར་སྒྲུབ་པའི་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླ་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ་སྟེ། [མྱུ་གུ་ཡོད་པར་]དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་བཟློག་ཟླ་ལ་མྱུ་གུ་མེད་པ་ཡིན་པ་དེ་འཇོག་པའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །

For this person, it [absurdly] follows that existence of self (*bdag yod pa*) is the object of negation of the probandum in the proof that the aggregates are selfless by the sign, dependent-arising, because [according to you, your] mode of assertion with regard to a sprout [that is, the nonexistence of sprout is the object of negation that is the opposite of the probandum of a correct sign proving that a sprout exists] is logically feasible. If you accept [that existence of self is the object of negation of the probandum in the proof that the aggregates are selfless by the sign, dependent-arising,] it very [absurdly] follows that it is reasonable to refute even the substratum.

ཁོ་རང་ལ་བདག་ཡོད་པ་དེ། རྟེན་འབྲེལ་གྱི་རྟགས་ཀྱིས་ཕུང་པོ་བདག་མེད་དུ་སྒྲུབ་པའི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་དགག་བྱར་ཐལ་ལོ། །མྱུ་གུའི་འདོད་ཚུལ་འཐད་པའི་ཕྱིར། [བདག་ཡོད་པ་དེ། རྟེན་འབྲེལ་གྱི་རྟགས་ཀྱིས་ཕུང་པོ་བདག་མེད་དུ་སྒྲུབ་པའི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱའི་དགག་བྱར་]འདོད་ན། ཁྱད་གཞི་ཡང་དགག་རིགས་པར་ཐལ་ལོ། །

1. Our own system

རང་ལུགས་ལ།

On this occasion, in order to ascertain emptiness it is necessary initially to identify the object of negation because if [the object of negation] is not identified, the emptiness that is the negative [of the object of negation] is not identified. In general, there are two [types] of objects of negation: objects of negation by the path and objects of negation by reasoning; among them, within the objects of negation by the path, there must be an existent because if there is not [an existent object of negation by the path], all sentient beings would be self-released, and the hardship of practicing the path would be meaningless.

སྐབས་འདིར་སྟོང་ཉིད་ངེས་པ་ལ་ཐོག་མར་དགག་བྱ་[བདེན་གྲུབ་]ངོས་ཟིན་དགོས་ཏེ། [སྟོང་ཉིད་ཀྱི་དགག་བྱ་བདེན་གྲུབ་]དེ་ངོས་མ་ཟིན་ན་[དགག་བྱ་བདེན་གྲུབ་]དེ་བཀག་པའི་སྟོང་པ་[བདེན་མེད་]ངོས་མི་ཟིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། སྤྱིར་དགག་བྱ་ལ་ལམ་གྱི་དགག་བྱ་[བདེན་འཛིན་ལྟ་བུ་]དང་རིགས་པའི་དགག་བྱ་[བདེན་གྲུབ་ལྟ་བུ་]གཉིས་ཡོད་པ་ལས་ལམ་གྱི་དགག་བྱ་ལ་ཡོད་པ་གཅིག་དགོས་ཏེ། [ལམ་གྱི་དགག་བྱ་བདེན་འཛིན་ལྟ་བུ་]དེ་མེད་ན་སེམས་ཅན་ཐམས་ཅད་[ལམ་ལ་འབད་མི་དགོས་པར་]རང་གྲོལ་དུ་འགྲོ་བ་དང་། ལམ་སྒོམ་པའི་ངལ་བ་དོན་མེད་དུ་འགྱུར་བའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །

With respect to objects of negation by correct reasoning, two types are taken as objects of negation—wrong apprehensions and the objects apprehended by them—because it is like, for example, the fact that with regard to objects of negation by the reasoning of dependence, since both (1) the apprehension of a thing as not depending on causes and conditions and (2) its object [that is, a thing's not depending on causes and conditions] are not logically feasible and not reasonable, they are treated as objects of negation.

རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ལ་ལོག་འཛིན་དང་དེས་བཟུང་བའི་ཡུལ་ལ་དགག་བྱར་བྱས་པ་གཉིས་ཡོད་དེ། དཔེར་ན་ལྟོས་པའི་རིགས་པའི་དགག་བྱ་ལ་དངོས་པོ་རྒྱུ་རྐྱེན་ལ་མ་ལྟོས་པར་

བཟུང་བ་དང་དེའི་ཡུལ་གཉིས་ཀ་མི་འཐད་པའམ་མི་རིགས་པས་ན་དགག་བྱར་མཛད་པ་ལྟ་བུ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

Although there are four [types] of correct reasoning—the reasonings of dependence, logicality, performance of function, and nature[a]—when

[a] For the four types of correct reasonings, Tsong-kha-pa explains in his *Great Exposition of Stages of the Path:*

> With respect to reasoned examination, from among the four reasonings:
>
> 1. The reasoning of dependence (*ltos pa'i rigs pa*, *apekṣāyukti*) is [from the viewpoint] that the arising of effects depends on causes and conditions. This moreover is examination from the approach of the conventional and the ultimate and their individual bases.
> 2. The reasoning of performance of function (*bya ba byed pa'i rigs pa*, *kāryakāraṇayukti*) is [from the viewpoint] that phenomena perform their respective functions, such as fire performing the function of burning and so forth. This moreover is examination that "This is the phenomenon; this is the agent; this phenomenon performs this action."
> 3. The reasoning of tenable proof (*'thad pas sgrub pa'i rigs pa*, *upapattisādhanayukti*) is to prove a meaning without contradicting valid cognition. This moreover is examination thinking whether concerning this the three valid cognitions—direct, inferential, or believable scripture—exist or not.
> 4. The reasoning of nature (*chos nyid kyi rigs pa, dharmatāyukti*) is to believe in (1) natures renowned in the world, such as heat being the nature of fire, moisture being the nature of water, and so forth, (2) inconceivable natures [such as placing a world-system in a single hair-pore, and so forth], and in the abiding nature, and not to contemplate other evidence for being such—examining this way.

རིགས་པ་ཚོལ་བ་ནི། རིགས་པ་བཞི་ལས་བལྟོས་པའི་རིགས་པ་ནི་འབྲས་བུ་རྣམས་འབྱུང་་[494b.2]བ་རྒྱུ་དང་རྐྱེན་ལ་བལྟོས་པའོ། །འདི་ཡང་། ཀུན་རྫོབ་དང་དོན་དམ་དང་དེ་དག་གི་གཞི་རྣམས་སོ་སོའི་སྒོ་ནས་ཚོལ་བའོ། །བྱ་བ་བྱེད་པའི་རིགས་པ་ནི་མེས་སྲེག་པའི་བྱ་བ་བྱེད་པ་སོགས་ཆོས་རྣམས་ཀྱིས་རང་རང་གི་བྱ་བ་བྱེད་པའོ། །འདི་ཡང་། [494b.3]འདི་ནི་ཆོས་སོ་འདི་ནི་བྱེད་པའོ་ཆོས་འདིས་ནི་བྱ་བ་འདི་བྱེད་དོ་ཞེས་ཚོལ་བའོ། །འཐད་པས་བསྒྲུབ་པའི་རིགས་པ་ནི་ཚད་མ་དང་མི་འགལ་བར་དོན་བསྒྲུབ་པའོ། །འདི་ཡང་། ཅི་འདི་ལ་མངོན་སུམ་དང་རྗེས་དཔག་དང་ཡིད་ཆེས་པའི་ལུང་གི་[494b.4]ཚད་མ་གསུམ་པོ་ཡོད་དམ་མེད་སྙམ་དུ་ཚོལ་བའོ། །ཆོས་ཉིད་ཀྱི་རིགས་པ་ནི། མེ་ཚ་བ་དང་ཆུ་རླན་པ་སོགས་ལ་དེ་དག་གི་ཆོས་ཉིད་དུ་འཇིག་རྟེན་ན་གྲགས་པའི་ཆོས་ཉིད་དང་། བསམ་གྱིས་མི་ཁྱབ་པའི་ཆོས་ཉིད་དང་། གནས་པའི་ཆོས་[494b.5]ཉིད་ལ་མོས་པར་བྱེད་ཅིང་། དེ་ལྟར་ཡིན་པའི་རྒྱུ་མཚན་གཞན་སེམས་པར་མི་བྱེད་དེ། དེ་ལྟར་ཚོལ་བའོ།

See Tsong-kha-pa, *lam rim chen mo,* in *gsung 'bum/ tsong kha pa/ bkras lhun par rnying/*

summarized they are included within two [types] because of being included into the reasoning of analyzing the ultimate and the reasoning of analyzing conventions.

Logically feasible (*'thad pa*), suitable (*rung ba*), and reasonable (*rigs pa*) are equivalent because Vasubandhu's *Principles of Explanation*[a] says such.

རིགས་པ་ཡང་[186a]དག་ལ་ལྟོས་པའི་[རིགས་པ་]དང་འཐད་པ[ར་]སྒྲུབ་པའི་[རིགས་པ་]དང་བྱ་བ་བྱེད་པའི་[རིགས་པ་]དང་ཆོས་ཉིད་ཀྱི་རིགས་པ་བཞི་ཡོད་ཀྱང་བསྡུས་ན་གཉིས་སུ་འདུ་སྟེ། དོན་དམ་དཔྱོད་པ[འི་རིགས་པ་]དང་ཐ་སྙད་དཔྱོད་པའི་རིགས་པ་གཉིས་སུ་འདུ་བའི་ཕྱིར། འཐད་པ་དང་རུང་བ་དང་རིགས་པ་དོན་གཅིག་སྟེ། རྣམ་བཤད་རིགས་པར་དེ་ལྟར་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The [*rigs pa* of] *'thad rigs* (*'thad pa dang rigs pa,* logicality and reasoning)[b] and the *rig pa* of *blo rig* (*blo dang rig pa,* awareness and knowledge) are not equivalent because in Tibetan the presence and absence of the suffix *sa* differ, and in Sanskrit the terms also differ since *yoṣir*[c] is used for [the *rigs pa* of] *'thad rigs* (logicality and reasoning) and *vidyā*[d] is used for [the *rig pa* of] *blo rig* (awareness and knowledge), and also that the meanings differ is to be known from the earlier [discussion] (see above, 68ff.). Therefore, the opposite of logicality is taken as an object of negation by reasoning because when comparing the high speech (*gsung rab, pravacana*) of Tsong-kha-pa and his spiritual sons [Khay-drub and Gyal-tshab], it turns out that the four non-reasonables, which are the opposites of the four reasonings, are taken as objects of negation.

---

d+ha sar bskyar par brgyab pa, TBRC W29193.13 (Dharamsala, India: she rig par khang, 1997), 494b.1-494b.5. See also the translation in Tsong kha pa, *The Great Treatise on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment,* vol. 3, 329.

[a] *rnam par bshad pa'i rigs pa, vyākyāyukti;* Beijing 5562, vol. 113; sde dge 4061, vol. *shi*.

[b] *rigs pa* in the context of *'thad pa*.

[c] 2011 TBRC *bla brang* and 1995 Mundgod revision of Ngawang Gelek *bla brang* (186a.3) read *yoṣir,* as does 'jam dbyangs bzhad pa, *dbu ma 'jug pa'i mtha' dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod* (Beijing, China: pe cin nyug hran shin 'gyig par khang, 2004), 190.3. I was not able to find the corresponding Sanskrit term for *yoṣir,* which might be *yukti*.

[d] Correcting *vidyā* for *vidya* in accordance with the context.

འཐད་རིགས་དང་བློ་རིག་གི་རིག་པ་དོན་མི་གཅིག་སྟེ། བོད་སྐད་ལ་ས་མཐའ་ཡོད་མེད་མི་འདྲ་ལ། རྒྱ་སྐད་ལ་ཡང་ཡོཀྟིར་འཐད་རིགས་དང་། ཧེ་ཏུ་བློ་རིག་ལ་འཇུག་པས་སྒྲ་ཡང་མི་[254]འདྲ་ལ་དོན་མི་འདྲ་བ་ཡང་སྔར་གྱི་དེས་ཤེས་པའི་ཕྱིར། དེས་ན་འཐད་པའི་བཟློག་ཟླ་ལ་རིགས་པའི་དགག་བྱར་བྱ་སྟེ། རིགས་པ་བཞིའི་བཟློག་ཟླ་མི་རིགས་པ་བཞི་ལ་དགག་བྱར་བྱེད་པར་རྗེ་ཡབ་སྲས་ཀྱི་གསུང་རབ་ཀུན་གོ་བསྟུར་ན་ཐོན་པ་དེའི་ཕྱིར།

Because correct reasoning (*rigs pa yang dag*) and correct sign (*rtags yang dag*) are not equivalent, the objects of negation by [a correct reasoning and a correct sign] are also not equivalent, and it is proper that, in accordance with statements by the lords of scholars [Gung-ru] Chö-kyi-jung-nay and Tag-lung-drag-pa [Lo-drö-gya-tsho],[a] that the objects of negation by correct signs are nonexistents because there are manifold scriptures and reasonings, those [cited] earlier and so forth. Here also [correct reasoning and correct sign] have been treated in this fashion.

རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་དང་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་དོན་མི་གཅིག་པས་དེ་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡང་དོན་མི་གཅིག་ལ། རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་མེད་པར་མཁས་དབང་[གུང་རུ་]ཆོས་འབྱུང་དང་སྟག་ལུང་གྲགས་པའི་གསུང་ལྟར་ལེགས་ཏེ། སྔར་གྱི་ལུང་རིགས་དེ་དག་སོགས་མང་བའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །འདིར་ཡང་དེའི་དབང་དུ་བྱས་སོ། །

2. Dispelling objections

རྩོད་སྤོང་ལ་

---

[a] *stag lung grags pa blo gros rgya mtsho* (1546-1618, Beijing 715). He was the 30th Throne Holder of Gandan.

10. Someone says: It follows that the subject, the apprehension[a] of true existence by an apprehension[b] of true existence, is not logically feasible because of being an object of negation by a correct reasoning. You have asserted the reason [which is that the apprehension of true existence by an apprehension of true existence is an object of negation by correct reasoning]. If you accept [that the apprehension of true existence by an apprehension of true existence is not logically feasible], it follows that the subject, [the apprehension of true existence by an apprehension of true existence,] does not exist because of not being logically feasible.

ཁོ་ན་རེ། བདེན་འཛིན་གྱིས་བདེན་པར་བཟུང་བ་ཆོས་ཅན། མི་འཐད་པར་ཐལ། རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [བདེན་འཛིན་གྱིས་བདེན་པར་བཟུང་བ་རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པ་]རྟགས་ཁས། [བདེན་འཛིན་གྱིས་བདེན་པར་བཟུང་བ་རིགས་པ་ཡང་དག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པར་]འདོད་ན། [བདེན་འཛིན་གྱིས་བདེན་པར་བཟུང་བ་]དེ་ཆོས་ཅན། མེད་པར་ཐལ། མི་འཐད་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: [Whatever is not logically feasible] is not necessarily [non-existent]. For him [that is, for the opponent,] it [absurdly] follows that each of the subjects, the Outsiders' reasonings proving the existence of a self of persons and their modes of explanation, do not exist because of not being logically feasible. The three spheres [of self-contradiction]!

[མི་འཐད་ན་མེད་པ་ཡིན་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ། ཁོ་རང་ལ། ཕྱི་[186b]རོལ་པའི་གང་ཟག་གི་བདག་ཡོད་པར་སྒྲུབ་པའི་རིགས་པ་དང་བཤད་ཚུལ་རེ་རེ་ནས་ཆོས་ཅན། མེད་པར་ཐལ། མི་འཐད་པའི་ཕྱིར། འཁོར་གསུམ།

11. Moreover, someone says: It follows that the subject, the apprehension of true existence, is an object of negation by a sign analyzing the ultimate because of being an object of negation by an inference that is a rational consciousness analyzing the ultimate.

---

[a] *bzung ba;* this is the action of apprehending something as truly existent.

[b] *'dzin;* this is the consciousness apprehending something as truly existent.

ཡང་ཁོ་ན་རེ། བདེན་འཛིན་ཆོས་ཅན། དོན་དམ་དཔྱོད་པའི་རྟགས་ཀྱི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། དོན་དམ་དཔྱོད་བྱེད་ཀྱི་རིགས་ཤེས་རྗེས་དཔག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: There is utterly no entailment [that whatever is an object of negation by an inference that is a rational consciousness analyzing the ultimate is necessarily an object of negation by a sign analyzing the ultimate].

[དོན་དམ་དཔྱོད་བྱེད་ཀྱི་རིགས་ཤེས་རྗེས་དཔག་གི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་ན་དོན་དམ་དཔྱོད་པའི་རྟགས་ཀྱི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པས་]ཤིན་ཏུ་མ་ཁྱབ།

Well then, it [absurdly] follows that [according to your assertion] the wisdom realizing the absence of true existence is a probandum of a correct sign proving the absence of true existence because [according to you your] thesis [that is, that the apprehension of true existence is the object of negation by a sign analyzing the ultimate,] is logically feasible.

འོ་ན་[ཁྱོད་ཀྱི་འདོད་པ་ལྟར་ན།] བདེན་མེད་རྟོགས་པའི་ཤེས་རབ་དེ་བདེན་མེད་དུ་སྒྲུབ་པའི་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་གི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱར་ཐལ། [བདེན་འཛིན་དོན་དམ་དཔྱོད་པའི་རྟགས་ཀྱི་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པའི་]དམ་བཅའ་འཐད་པའི་ཕྱིར།

B. Individually identifying the object of negation in the Autonomy School and the Consequence School {2 parts}

This section has two parts: explaining the object of negation in the systems of the Autonomy School and the Consequence School

གཉིས་པ་[ཐལ་རང་གི་དགག་བྱ་སོ་སོར་ངོས་འཛིན་པ་]ལ་རང་རྒྱུད་པའི་ལུགས་དང་། ཐལ་འགྱུར་བའི་ལུགས་ཀྱི་དགག་བྱ་བཤད་པ་གཉིས།

1. Explaining the object of negation in the system of the Autonomy School

དང་པོ་[རང་རྒྱུད་པའི་ལུགས་ཀྱི་དགག་བྱ་བཤད་པ་]ནི།

In Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'"* this is:[a]

> A clear identification of the object of negation does not emerge in other reliable sourcebooks of the Autonomy School, but the existence that is the opposite of the mode of conventional existence described in Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle* is to be known as ultimate or true existence, and, therefore, let us explain it that way. This text says:[b]
>
> > A mistaken awareness that superimposes—on things that in reality [or ultimately] are natureless—an aspect opposite to that [naturelessness] is called an "obscurer" (*kun rdzob, saṃvṛti*) because it obstructs [itself] from [perception of] suchness or because it veils [other awarenesses] from perception of suchness. [The *Descent into Laṅkā*]

---

[a] Tsong-kha-pa, *dgongs pa rab gsal,* 130.3-136.20; the translation is from Hopkins, *Tsong-kha-pa's Final Exposition of Wisdom,* 189-200; there are a few slight differences in choice of translation terms as indicated below when passages are cited from this.

[b] *dbu ma snang ba, madhyamakāloka;* sde dge 3887, *dbu ma,* vol. *sa,* 228a.7-228b.3.

Sūtra also says:[a]

> The production of things [exists] conventionally (*kun rdzob tu*, *saṃvṛtyā*);
> Ultimately it lacks inherent existence.
> That [consciousness] mistaken with regard to the lack of inherent existence
> Is asserted as the obscurer of reality (*yang dag kun rdzob*, *satyaṃ saṃvṛti*).

All false things seen displayed by that [consciousness apprehending them as if they are truly established] due to having arisen from it are called "just obscurational."[b] Moreover, that [apprehension

---

[a] *lang kar gshegs pa'i mdo, laṅkāvatārasūtra,* stanza X.429; Sanskrit in Bunyiu Nanjio, *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra,* 319: *bhāvā vidyanti saṃvṛtyā paramārthe na bhāvakāḥ / niḥsvabhāveṣu yā bhrāntistatsatyaṃ saṃvṛtirbhavet //.*

[b] *kun rdzob pa kho na.* I [Hopkins] take it that what arise from a consciousness conceiving true existence are not the false things themselves but the display, or appearance, of them as truly existent. Ngag-wang-pal-dan, on the other hand, holds that what arises from a consciousness apprehending true existence is an artificial apprehension of true existence in the continuum of a Proponent of True Existence. In his *Annotations for (Jam-yang-shay-pa's) "Great Exposition of Tenets"* (Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound,* 740-742) he recasts the meaning of this passage as follows:

> The subject, an innate consciousness conceiving true existence, which conceives that phenomena ultimately exist inherently whereas they do not, is called an "obscurer" (*kun rdzob*, *saṃvṛti*) or obstructor (*sgrib byed*) because a consciousness conceiving true existence, like an eye obstructed by an eye disease, obstructs itself from seeing suchness [or] this consciousness conceiving true existence veils other awarenesses from seeing suchness, like covering something with a cloth. This is because the *Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra* says:
>
> > The production of things [exists] conventionally (*kun rdzob tu*, *saṃvṛtyā*);
> > Ultimately it lacks inherent existence.
> > That [consciousness] mistaken regarding the lack of inherent existence
> > Is asserted as the obscurer of reality (*yang dag kun rdzob*, *satyaṃ saṃvṛti*).
>
> …Since an artificial awareness in the continuum of a Proponent of True Existence arises from that consciousness conceiving true existence, all false things such as forms and so forth—which are the observed objects of such an artificial awareness that sees them displayed by that consciousness conceiving true existence as if they are truly existent—exist only conventionally, not ultimately. Not only does that artificial awareness arise from a consciousness conceiving true existence but also this consciousness conceiving true existence arises through the maturation of beginningless predispositions for mistake. This consciousness conceiving true existence displays truly established phenomena to all living beings

of true existence] arises through the maturation of beginningless predispositions for mistake, whereby all living beings see [phenomena] displayed as if they had an inherent nature in reality. Therefore, all entities of false things—[existing] through the power of those [sentient beings' non-defective] thoughts [that is, conceptual and non-conceptual consciousnesses unaffected by superficial causes of mistake[a]]—are said "only to exist conventionally."

རྣམ་བཤད་ལས། རང་རྒྱུད་པའི་གཞུང་ཞེས་པ་ནས་། [ཁུངས་ཐུབ་གཞན་ལས་དགག་བྱ་ངོས་འཛིན་གསལ་བར་མི་འབྱུང་ལ། དབུ་མ་སྣང་བ་ལས་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་ཡོད་ཚུལ་བཤད་པའི་བརྗོད་ཕྱོགས་ཀྱི་ཡོད་པ་ནི་དོན་དམ་པར་རམ་བདེན་ཡོད་དུ་ཤེས་པས་དེ་ལྟར་བཤད་ན། དེ་ཉིད་ལས། དངོས་པོ་ཡང་དག་པར་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་མེད་པ་དག་ལ་ཡང་དེ་ལས་ལྡོག་པའི་རྣམ་པར་སྒྲོ་འདོགས་པའི་འཁྲུལ་པའི་བློ་གང་ཡིན་པ་དེ་ནི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཅེས་བྱ་སྟེ། འདིའམ་འདིས་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་སྒྲིབ་པ་ལྟ་བུར་བྱེད། འགེབས་པ་ལྟ་བུར་བྱེད་པའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །དེ་སྐད་དུ་མདོ་ལས་ཀྱང་། དངོས་རྣམས་སྐྱེ་བ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ། །དམ་པའི་དོན་དུ་རང་བཞིན་མེད། །རང་བཞིན་མེད་ལ་འཁྲུལ་པ་

as if they exist, whether their awarenesses are affected by systems of tenets or not, and those living beings also perceive them that way.

Therefore, since it would not be suitable to posit phenomena as existing through the force of appearing to a consciousness conceiving true existence, existence that is posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness—its factors of appearance and conception not being affected by the force of a consciousness conceiving true existence—is the meaning of existing conventionally. Hence, the object of negation, true existence, does not appear to sense consciousnesses.

Ngag-wang-pal-dan's reading strikes me as excessively complicated, but the matter requires more analysis.

[a] Four types of consciousnesses affected by superficial causes of mistake are enumerated:

- cause of mistake existing in the object: for instance, a consciousness perceiving a circle of fire due to a firebrand being twirled quickly
- cause of mistake existing in the basis: for instance, an eye consciousness that sees a single moon as double due to a fault in the eye
- cause of mistake existing in the abode: for instance, an eye consciousness that sees trees as moving when a person is riding in a boat (causing stationary objects on the shore to appear to move)
- cause of mistake existing in the immediately preceding condition: for instance, an eye consciousness that sees everything as red when a person is overcome by anger.

See Lati Rinbochay and Elizabeth Napper, *Mind in Tibetan Buddhism* (London: Rider, 1980; Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 1980), 51-52.

གང་། །དེ་ནི་ཡང་དག་ཀུན་རྫོབ་འདོད། །ཅེས་གསུངས་སོ། །དེ་ལས་བྱུང་བའི་ཕྱིར་དེས་ཉེ་བར་བསྟན་པ་མཐོང་བའི་དངོས་པོ་བརྟེན་པ་ཐམས་ཅད་ནི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་པ་ཁོ་ན་ཡིན་ཞེས་[72a]བྱའོ། །དེ་ཡང་ཐོག་མ་མེད་པའི་འཁྲུལ་པའི་བག་ཆགས་ཡོངས་སུ་སྨིན་པའི་དབང་གིས་བྱུང་ལ། དེས་ཀྱང་སྲོག་ཆགས་ཐམས་ཅད་ལ་ཡང་དག་པར་དངོས་པོའི་བདག་ཉིད་ལྟ་བུར་ཉེ་བར་བསྟན་པ་མཐོང་བར་འགྱུར་ཏེ། དེའི་ཕྱིར་དེ་དག་གི་བསམ་པའི་དབང་གིས་དངོས་པོ་བརྟེན་པའི་ངོ་བོ་ཐམས་ཅད་ནི། ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་ཡོད་པ་ཁོ་ནའོ་ཞེས་བྱའོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་སོ། །

[In that quotation:]

The passage "A mistaken awareness that superimposes—on things that in reality [or ultimately] are natureless—an aspect opposite to that [naturelessness]" refers to [a consciousness] mistaking what does not ultimately exist inherently to exist ultimately.

The passage "…is called an 'obscurer' (*kun rdzob, saṃvṛti*) because it obstructs [itself] from [perception of] suchness or because it veils [other awarenesses] from perception of suchness" is the meaning of "the obscurer of reality (*yang dag kun rdzob*, *satyaṃ saṃvṛti*)" [in the quote from the *Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra*]. *Saṃvṛti* [here] is taken as [meaning] "obstructor" (*sgrib byed*), obstructing reality.

Due to having arisen from a consciousness conceiving true existence, that which sees the display—by a consciousness conceiving true existence—as if [objects] are truly established is a conceptual consciousness, not a sense consciousness. For, Jñānagarbha's[a] *Autocommentary on "Differentiation of the Two Truths"* [b] explains that true [existence]—the object of negation—does not appear to sense consciousnesses, and it is

[a] Jñānagarbha is taken to be a proponent of the Sūtra Middle Way Autonomy School.

[b] *bden pa gnyis rnam par 'byed pa'i 'grel pa, satyadvayavibhaṅgavṛtti;* sde dge 3882, *dbu ma,* vol. *sa,* 5b.3-6a.2; Tibetan and English in Eckel, *Jñānagarbha's Commentary,* 160-161 and 75-76. Jñānagarbha states in his autocommentary to stanza 8abc that "Imputed objects are production [existing] in reality, and so forth" (*brtags pa'i don ni yang dag par skye ba la sogs pa*) and that "Production [existing] in reality, and so forth, do not appear" (*yang dag par skye ba la sogs pa ni mi snang ste*). In stanza 9ab, he states that "Since the negation of production, and so forth, is concordant with reality, we assert it" (*skye la sogs pa bkag pa yang / yang dag pa dang mthun phyir 'dod*). His autocommentary explains "production" (*skye*) as "real production" (*yang dag par skye ba*), and that the negation of

the same here [in Kamalashīla's Yogic Middle Way Autonomy School].

The passage "Moreover, that [apprehension of true existence] arises through the maturation of beginningless predispositions for mistake" indicates that this apprehension of true existence is innate. Therefore, [Kamalashīla] speaks of "all living beings."

The "thoughts" of those living beings are not just conceptual consciousnesses but also are to be taken as non-conceptual consciousnesses.

False things—that is to say, that do not exist ultimately but are posited as existing through the force of those two [conceptual and non-conceptual consciousnesses]—exist only conventionally. This is the meaning of the statement in the *[Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra],* "The production of things [exists] conventionally (*kun rdzob tu*, *saṃvṛtyā*)." Moreover, this does not mean that [such falsities] exist conventionally in the sense of existing for a *saṃvṛti* (*kun rdzob*) that is an apprehender of true existence. [Rather, they exist for a *saṃvṛti* (*kun rdzob*) that is a conventional valid consciousness.]

Since this is the case, [in the Autonomy School] "to exist in the manner of an objective mode of abiding without being posited through appearing to an awareness, or through the force of an awareness"[a] is to truly exist, to ultimately exist, and to exist as [the object's own] reality, and apprehending such is an innate apprehension of true existence.

དེ་ནི་ཞེས་པ་ཡན་ནི་དོན་དམ་པར་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་ལ་དོན་དམ་པར་ཡོད་པར་འཁྲུལ་པའི་དོན་ནོ། །ཀུན་རྫོབ་ནས་ཕྱིར་རོལ་བར་ནི་ཡང་དག་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཅེས་པའི་དོན་ཏེ། ཀུན་རྫོབ་སྒྲིབ་བྱེད་ལ་བྱས་ནས་ཡང་དག་པ་ལ་སྒྲིབ་པར་བྱེད་པའོ། །བདེན་འཛིན་དེ་ལས་བྱུང་བའི་ཕྱིར་བདེན་འཛིན་དེས་བདེན་པར་ཡོད་པ་ལྟར་ཉེ་བར་བསྟན་པ་མཐོང་བ་ནི་རྟོག་པ་ཡིན་གྱི་དབང་ཤེས་མིན་ཏེ། བདེན་གཉིས་ཀྱི་འགྲེལ་པར་དགག་བྱ་བདེན་པ་དབང་ཤེས་ལ་མི་སྣང་བར་བཤད་པ་འདིར་ཡང་འདྲ་བའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །དེ་ཡང་

---

real production "we assert as the ultimate" (*don dam pa yin par kho bo cag 'dod do*). Putting these assertions together, one can see why Tsong-kha-pa states that Jñānagarbha's object of negation—the negation of which is the ultimate—does not appear to sense consciousnesses.

[a] *blo la snang ba'am blo'i dbang gis bzhag pa min par don gyi sdod lugs su yod pa.*

ནས་བྱུང་བའི་བར་གྱིས་ནི་བདེན་འཛིན་དེ་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་སུ་སྟོན་ཏོ། །དེས་ན་སྲོག་ཆགས་ཐམས་ཅད་ལ་ཞེས་སྨོས་སོ། ། སྲོག་ཆགས་དེ་དག་གི་བསམ་པ་ནི་རྟོག་པ་ཁོ་ན་མིན་གྱི། རྟོག་མེད་ཀྱི་ཤེས་པ་ལ་ཡང་བྱ་སྟེ། དེ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་དབང་གིས་ཡོད་པར་བཞག་པའི་དོན་དམ་བར་ཡོད་པ་མིན་པའི་དངོས་པོ་བརྟེན་པ་རྣམས་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཁོ་ནར་ཡོད་པ་ནི། དངོས་རྣམས་སྐྱེ་བ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ། ཞེས་པའི་དོན་ཏེ། དེ་ཡང་བདེན་འཛིན་གྱི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་ཡོད་པའི་དོན་མིན་ནོ། །དེ་ལྟར་བྱས་ན་བློ་ལ་སྣང་བའམ་བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་མིན་པར་དོན་གྱི་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་ཡོད་པ་ནི། བདེན་པ་དང་དོན་དམ་དང་ཡང་དག་པར་[72b]ཡོད་པ་དང་དེར་འཛིན་པ་ནི་བདེན་འཛིན་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་སོ། །

Objection: Implicit to the statement in Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle:*[a]

> That "ultimately there is no production" is to be explained as that "the production of these is not established by a consciousness of reality."

is an explanation that to be ultimately existent and ultimately produced is to be established—as existent and as produced—by a rational consciousness[b] understanding suchness. [Since, just above, you have explained that the meaning of being ultimately existent is to exist in the manner of an objective mode of abiding without being posited through appearing to an awareness or through the force of an awareness,] how [do you take Kamalashīla's explanation]?

Answer: That is true. You need to understand that the qualification "ultimately" is affixed in two ways to the object of negation:

1. Rational consciousnesses of hearing, thinking, and meditating are taken as the ultimate [consciousness], and what is not established by them [is not ultimately established, that is to say, not established for an ultimate consciousness], as described [by Kamalashīla just] above.
2. Existing in an objective mode of abiding without being posited through the force of an awareness is posited as [the meaning of] ultimately existing [and not existing this way is posited as the meaning of not being ultimately established].

---

[a] sde dge 3887, *dbu ma,* vol. *sa,* 229b.3.

[b] *rigs shes.*

The first of these two ultimates [that is, a rational consciousness of hearing, thinking, or meditating], as well as something that is established in its perspective [namely, emptiness], exists. However, both the latter ultimate [that is, existence in an objective mode of abiding without being posited through the force of an awareness] and something that exists that way do not occur.[a]

འོ་ན་སྣང་བ་ལས། དོན་དམ་པར་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་དོ་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ནི། འདི་དག་ཡང་དག་པའི་ཤེས་པས་སྐྱེ་བ་མ་གྲུབ་པོ་ཞེས་བཤད་པར་འགྱུར་རོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཤུགས་ཀྱིས་དོན་དམ་པར་ཡོད་པ་དང་། སྐྱེ་བ་ནི་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་ལ་འཇུག་པའི་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱིས་སྐྱེ་བར་དང་ཡོད་པར་གྲུབ་པ་ལ་བཤད་པ་ཇི་ལྟར་ཡིན་ཞེ་ན། བདེན་ཏེ་དགག་བྱ་ལ་དོན་དམ་གྱི་ཁྱད་པར་སྦྱར་བའི་དོན་དམ་ལ་གཉིས་ཤེས་དགོས་ཏེ། ཐོས་བསམ་སྒོམ་གསུམ་གྱི་རིགས་ཤེས་ལ་དོན་དམ་དུ་བྱས་ནས། དེས་ཐར་བཤད་པ་ལྟར་མ་གྲུབ་པ་གཅིག་དང་། བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་མིན་པར་དོན་གྱི་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་ཡོད་པ་ལ། དོན་དམ་དུ་ཡོད་པར་བཞག་པ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་དང་པོའི་དོན་དམ་དང་། དེའི་ངོར་གྲུབ་པ་ཡང་ཡོད་ལ། ཕྱི་མའི་དོན་དམ་དང་དེར་ཡོད་པ་གཉིས་ཀ་ཡང་མི་སྲིད་དོ། །

Therefore, although whatever exists ultimately in the latter sense would exist ultimately in the former sense,[b] the apprehension of the former type of existence [that is, the apprehension that

---

[a] Ngag-wang-pal-dan (Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound,* 743-744) rephrases this:

The “ultimate” in “not existing ultimately” has two types:

1. A conceptual rational consciousness of hearing, thinking, or meditating that analyzes suchness is taken as the ultimate, and not existing as able to bear analysis by that conceptual rational consciousness is posited as “not existing ultimately.”
2. Existing in an objective mode of subsistence without being merely posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness is posited as “existing ultimately,” and not existing in that way is posited as “not existing ultimately.”

Concerning these:

1. Both the ultimate in the first mode of positing [that is, a conceptual rational consciousness analyzing suchness] and something established in its perspective [namely, emptiness] exist.
2. Both the ultimate of the second mode of positing [that is, existing in an objective mode of subsistence without being merely posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness] and something established as it do not exist.

[b] Ngag-wang-pal-dan (Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound,* 744-745) expands on this:

Whatever is established as the ultimate of the second mode of positing [that is,

an object is established for a rational consciousness] is not an innate apprehension of true existence.[a] To have such an [innate] apprehension of true existence, one must apprehend the latter type of existence [that is, one must apprehend that an object has an objective mode of abiding not posited through the force of an awareness].

Not differentiating these [two meanings of "ultimate"], many have held that the measure of the object of negation is "that which is able to bear reasoned analysis"[b] or "a thing able to bear analysis."[c] In dependence upon this, it appears that many mistakes asserting that ultimate truths are not established bases [that is, do not exist] or that ultimate truths are truly established have arisen. If these [facts] are understood well, you will understand the essential points that the statements that "[the noumenon] does not exist as [its own] basic disposition" and that "[the noumenon] does not exist ultimately"[d] do not contradict the assertion that the noumenon[e] exists and the proposition that it is the basic disposition [of phenomena] and is the ultimate.[f]

---

as existing in an objective mode of subsistence without being posited through the force of an awareness] would [hypothetically] be established for the ultimate of the former mode of positing [that is, would be established in the perspective of a conceptual rational consciousness of hearing, thinking, or meditating that analyzes suchness] because whatever truly exists must be established as the final mode of subsistence, and whatever is established as the final mode of subsistence must be found by a rational consciousness examining the final mode of being.

Whatever is established in the perspective of the former ultimate [that is, in the perspective of a conceptual rational consciousness] is not necessarily established as the latter ultimate [as existing in an objective mode of subsistence without being posited through the force of an awareness] because having analyzed whether or not something truly exists, a rational consciousness finds non-establishment of true existence, and it does not find true existence.

[a] Emptiness is established for a rational consciousness but is not truly established, and the apprehension that any other phenomenon is established for such a rational consciousness is artificial and not innate.

[b] *rigs pas dpyad bzod.*

[c] *dpyad bzod pa'i dngos po.*

[d] *gshis lugs la dang don dam du med.*

[e] *chos nyid, dharmatā.*

[f] Ngag-wang-pal-dan (Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound,* 745) gives more detail:

If these are understood well, you will know that it is not contradictory:

- to say that something is not established as [its own] mode of disposition (*gshis lugs su ma grub pa*) and is not ultimately established

དེས་ན་ཕྱི་མའི་དོན་དམ་དུ་ཡོད་པ་ལ་སྔ་མའི་དོན་དམ་དུ་ཡོད་པས་ཁྱབ་ཀྱང་། སྔ་མའི་ཡོད་འཛིན་ནི་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཀྱི་བདེན་འཛིན་མིན་ལ། དེའི་བདེན་འཛིན་ལ་ནི་ཕྱི་མའི་ཡོད་འཛིན་དགོས་སོ། །འདི་མ་ཕྱེད་པར་དགག་བྱའི་ཚད་འཛིན་རིགས་པས་དཔྱད་བཟོད་དང་། དཔྱད་བཟོད་ཀྱི་དངོས་པོ་ལ་འཛིན་པ་མང་དུ་བྱུང་ཞིང་། དེ་ལ་བརྟེན་ནས་དོན་དམ་བདེན་པ་གཞི་མ་གྲུབ་དང་། བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་འདོད་པའི་ནོར་པ་མང་དུ་བྱུང་སྣང་ངོ་། །འདི་ལེགས་པར་ཤེས་ན་གཉིས་ལུགས་ལ་དང་། དོན་དམ་དུ་མེད་ཟེར་བ་དང་། ཡང་ཆོས་ཉིད་ཡོད་པར་འདོད་ཅིང་དེ་ཉིད་གཉིས་ལུགས་དང་དོན་དམ་ཡིན་པར་སྨྲ་བ་མི་འགལ་བའི་གནད་རྣམས་ཤེས་པར་འགྱུར་རོ། །

Indicating truth and falsity relative to worldly persons through the example of a magician's illusion

Since for understanding the styles of existence posited and not posited through the force of an awareness, making these known in terms of the example of a [magician's] illusion is praised, let us explain it. When a magician causes a pebble, twig, or the like to appear as a horse or elephant, there are three [types of persons present]:

1. the magician
2. the audience whose eyes have been affected [by the mantra the magician has cast]
3. [a person who comes later and thus] whose eyes have not been affected [by the mantra].

For the first [that is, the magician] there is the mere appearance as a horse or elephant, but he/she does not adhere to such [as being

---

- and to assert that ultimate truths exist and to propound that ultimate truths are the mode of subsistence and are ultimates.

Due to not distinguishing these, there arose explanations such as:

- The great translator Ngog [Lo-dan-shay-rab (*blo ldan shes rab, rngog lo chen po,* 1059-1109)], sole eye of the snowy land, said that ultimate truths are not objects of knowledge.
- The lord of reasoning Cha-pa Chö-kyi-seng-ge (*cha pa* or *phywa pa chos kyi seng ge,* 1109-1169) asserted that ultimate truths are truly established in the sense of being able to bear analysis by reasoning.
- Dro-lung-pa's (*gro lung pa blo gros 'byung gnas,* eleventh century) *Stages of the Teaching* and so forth explain that through dividing one awareness by way of conceptually isolatable factors [it can be said that] there is no object of a rational consciousness, but there is an object of an inferential consciousness.

true]. The second [the audience whose eyes have been affected] have both the appearance [as horse or elephant] and adherence to that appearance. The third [a person whose eyes have not been affected] has neither the appearance as a horse or elephant nor adherence to it.

When, for example, a rope is mistaken as a snake, it is said that the rope is a snake in the perspective of that consciousness but in general is not a snake. However, it is not suitable to say that similarly, when a basis of conjuring appears as a horse or elephant, the appearance as a horse or elephant is only in the perspective of a mistaken consciousness but in general the basis of conjuring **does not appear** as a horse or elephant [because it does]. Even though that qualification [that is, "in general"] is not affixed, it must be asserted that the basis of conjuring does appear as a horse or elephant because if this were not the case, mistakes regarding appearances would not occur.

གཉིས་པ་ནི། བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་དང་མ་བཞག་པའི་[73a]ཡོད་པ་ཇི་ལྟར་ཡིན་ཤེས་པ་ལ། སྒྱུ་མའི་དཔེའི་སྟེང་ནས་ཤེས་པར་བྱེད་པ་བརྟགས་པས་དེ་བཤད་ན། སྒྱུ་མ་མཁན་གྱིས་རྫི་ཤིང་སོགས་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྤྲུལ་པ་ན། སྒྱུ་མ་མཁན་དང་མིག་བསླད་པའི་ལྟད་མོ་བ་དང་། མིག་མ་བསླད་པ་གསུམ་གྱི་དང་པོ་ལ། རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་བ་ཙམ་ཡོད་ཀྱི་དེར་ཞེན་པ་མེད་ལ། གཉིས་པ་ལ། དེར་སྣང་དང་དེར་ཞེན་གཉིས་ཀ་ཡོད། གསུམ་པ་ལ། རྟ་གླང་གི་སྣང་ཞེན་གཉིས་ཀ་མེད་དོ། །སྤྲུལ་གཞི་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་བ་ན། དཔེར་ན་ཐག་པ་ལ་སྦྲུལ་དུ་འཁྲུལ་པའི་ཚེ་ཤེས་པ་དེའི་ངོར་ཐག་པ་སྦྲུལ་ཡིན་གྱི། སྤྱིར་སྦྲུལ་མིན་ཞེས་ཟེར་བ་བཞིན་དུ། ཤེས་པ་འཁྲུལ་ངོ་ཙམ་དུ་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་བ་ཡིན་གྱི། སྤྱིར་སྤྲུལ་གཞི་རྟ་གླང་དུ་མི་སྣང་ཞེས་བྱར་མི་རུང་གི། ཁྱད་པར་དེ་ལྟར་མ་སྦྱར་ཡང་སྤྲུལ་གཞི་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་བར་ཁས་བླང་དགོས་ཏེ། ད་ལྟ་མ་ཡིན་ན་སྣང་བ་ལ་འཁྲུལ་བ་མི་སྲིད་པར་འགྱུར་བའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །

Therefore, that the basis of conjuring can be posited as appearing as a horse or elephant is, according to the magician, through the force of appearing that way to a mistaken awareness; it is not posited otherwise through the force of the mode of abiding of the basis of conjuring itself. As for the audience, the appearance as a horse or elephant does not seem to be posited through the force of an internal awareness; rather, they conceive that there is a fully qualified horse or elephant dwelling on that place where the appearance is, covering that spot.

In terms of the example, those are how something is apprehended to be posited through the force of an awareness and is apprehended not to be posited through the force of an awareness. When a basis [that is, an object] appears in a certain way, there are two [types]—those that do and do not correspond with the mode of subsistence in accordance with how it appears.

དེས་ན་སྤྲུལ་གཞི་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་བར་འཛོག་ནུས་པ་དེ། །སྒྱུ་མ་མཁན་ལྟར་ན་བློ་འཁྲུལ་པ་ལ་དེ་ལྟར་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་འཛོག་གི །དེ་ལྟར་མིན་པར་སྤྲུལ་གཞི་རང་གི་སྡོད་ལུགས་ཀྱི་དབང་གིས་འཛོག་པ་མིན་ནོ། །ལྟད་མོ་བ་ལ་ནི་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་བ་དེ་ནང་གི་བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པར་མི་འཆར་གྱི། གཞི་གང་དུ་སྣང་བ་དེར་རྟ་གླང་མཚན་ཉིད་པ་གཅིག་ཡུལ་གྱི་གོ་ས་མནན་ནས་བསྡད་པར་འཛིན་ནོ། །དེ་ནི་དཔེའི་སྟེང་ནས་བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་དང་མ་བཞག་པར་འཛིན་པའི་ཚུལ་ཏེ། གཞི་དེར་སྣང་བ་དེ་ཤར་བ་ན་སྣང་བ་ལྟར་གྱི་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་འགྲོ་བ་དང་མི་འགྲོ་བ་གཉིས་ཡོད་དོ། །

When you understand well this [presentation of how phenomena are posited through the force of awareness according to the Autonomy School], you will come to differentiate the two positions [of the Autonomy School and the Proponents of True Existence which some] confuse. They think:

> Objects of comprehension [that is, all objects] are posited through the force of valid cognitions, and since valid cognitions are awarenesses, the positing of objects of comprehension through them is a case of positing [objects] through the force of an awareness. Hence, even the systems of the Proponents of True Existence refute true establishment.

[However,] that objects of comprehension are posited [that is, certified] through the force of valid cognitions means that valid cognitions realize the mode of abiding of the two [types of] objects of comprehension.[a] Therefore, the two—this [meaning of positing or certifying objects of comprehension] and the former [meaning of positing objects through the force of an awareness according to the Autonomy School] are utterly dissimilar.

དེ་ལེགས་པར་གོ་ན་ཚད་[73b]མའི་དབང་གིས་གཞལ་བྱ་འཛོག་པ་ལ། ཚད་མ་ཡང་བློ་ཡིན་པས་དེས་གཞལ་བྱ་འཛོག་པ་ཡང་བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པར་འགྱུར་བས། དངོས་

[a] The two types of objects of comprehension are specifically and generally characterized objects, or impermanent and permanent objects, or manifest and hidden objects.

པོར་སྨྲ་བ་རྣམས་ཀྱི་ལུགས་ཀྱིས་ཀྱང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཁེགས་པར་འགྱུར་རོ་སྙམ་དུ། ཕྱོགས་དེ་གཉིས་འདྲེས་པ་ཕྱེད་པར་འགྱུར་ཏེ། ཚད་མའི་དབང་གིས་གཞལ་བྱ་འཇོག་པ་ནི་གཞལ་བྱ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་སྡོད་ལུགས་ཚད་མས་རྟོགས་པའི་དོན་ཡིན་པས། དེ་དང་སྒྱུ་མ་གཉིས་གདན་མི་འདྲ་བའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །

According to Yogic Middle Way [Autonomists, who do not assert external objects], the appearance of such an illusion is established [that is, certified] by a self-knowing direct perception, and according to [Sūtra Middle Way Autonomists], who assert external objects, the appearance of such an illusion is established [that is, certified] by a sense direct perception apprehending the basis—for instance, the area [on which the illusion appears] or intermediate space [in which it appears].

With respect to its not existing in accordance with how it appears, [that the illusory horse or elephant exists as it appears] is refuted with signs [that is, reasons] such as, "If it did exist that way, it would be seen by those whose eyes are not affected [by the mantra], but they do not see it," and so forth. At this time, a combination of the two—appearing that way and an emptiness of that—is established, at which point [the illusion] is established as a falsity relative to an ordinary conventional awareness not involved in [philosophical] tenets. Hence, an awareness that establishes [or certifies] this [composite of appearance and emptiness] and a reflection's emptiness of what it appears to be is not asserted to be either a coarse or a subtle rational consciousness.[a]

Even if something is truly established in terms of a conventional ordinary awareness,[b] if [an object] appears as that, it could not be empty of it, and also if it is empty of that, it could not appear that way. Hence, if a combination of those two [that is, appearing one way and existing another] occurs, it is only a falsity in terms

[a] *rigs shes*. A coarse rational consciousness establishes a coarse selflessness, whereas a subtle rational consciousness establishes a subtle selflessness.

[b] "True establishment *in terms of a conventional ordinary awareness*" does not refer to the object of negation as the term "true establishment" usually does but to something that is true on the conventional level. Even on the conventional level, if something is true, there will be no conflict between how it appears and how it is; it will not appear to be something and yet not be that, and correspondingly if it is empty of something, that is, if it is not something, it will not appear to be that. Therefore, a magician's illusion, since it appears to be a real object and yet is not, cannot be true (or truly established) in a conventional sense of true establishment and thus must be a falsity, appearing one way and existing another.

of an ordinary awareness.

དེ་ལྟར་སྒྱུ་མའི་སྣང་བ་ནི་རྣལ་འབྱོར་སྤྱོད་པའི་དབུ་མ་པ་ལྟར་ན་རང་རིག་མངོན་སུམ་དང་། ཕྱི་རོལ་ཁས་ལེན་པའི་རང་རྒྱུད་པ་ལྟར་ན་ས་ཕྱོགས་སམ་བར་སྣང་ལྟ་བུའི་གཞི་འཛིན་པའི་དབང་པོའི་མངོན་སུམ་གྱིས་འགྲུབ་ལ། སྣང་བ་ལྟར་དུ་མེད་པ་ནི་དེ་ལྟར་དུ་ཡོད་ན་མིག་མ་བསླད་པས་མཐོང་བར་འགྱུར་བ་ལས། དེས་མ་མཐོང་བའི་ཕྱིར་ཞེས་སོགས་ཀྱི་རྟགས་ཀྱིས་ཁེགས་པ་ན་དེར་སྣང་དང་དེས་སྟོང་གཉིས་ཚོགས་པ་གྲུབ་པ་ན། གྲུབ་མཐར་མ་ཞུགས་པའི་ཐ་སྙད་པའི་བློ་རང་དགའ་བ་ལ་ལྟོས་པའི་བརྫུན་པར་འགྲུབ་པས། དེ་དང་གཟུགས་བརྙན་གང་དུ་སྣང་བས་སྟོང་པ་གྲུབ་པའི་བློ་ནི་རིགས་ཤེས་ཕྲ་རགས་གང་དུ་ཡང་མི་འོང་ངོ་། །ཐ་སྙད་པའི་བློ་རང་དགའ་བའི་དབང་དུ་བྱས་པའི་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཡིན་ན་ཡང་། དེར་སྣང་བྱུང་ན་དེས་སྟོང་མི་འོང་ལ། དེས་སྟོང་བྱུང་ནའང་དེར་སྣང་མི་འོང་བས། །དེ་གཉིས་ཚོགས་པ་བྱུང་ན་བློ་རང་དགའ་བའི་དབང་དུ་བྱས་པའི་བརྫུན་པ་པོ་ནའོ། །

Explanation within applying the example to the meaning

When external and internal phenomena appear as truly existent, sentient beings, like the audience of magic whose eyes are affected [by the mantra cast by the magician], apprehend that there is a mode of subsistence of those phenomena not posited through the force of an awareness. This apprehension is the innate apprehension of true existence which has operated beginninglessly.

གསུམ་པ་ནི། སྒྱུ་མའི་ལྟད་མོ་བ་མིག་བསླད་པ་བཞིན་དུ་སེམས་ཅན་རྣམས་ཀྱིས་ཕྱི་ནང་གི་ཆོས་འདི་རྣམས་བདེན་པར་ཡོད་པར་སྣང་བ་ན། བློ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་མིན་པར་ཆོས་དེ་རྣམས་ཀྱི་སྡོད་ལུགས་ཞིག་ཡོད་པར་[74a]འཛིན་པ་ནི། ཐོག་མ་མེད་པ་ནས་ཞུགས་པའི་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཀྱི་བདེན་འཛིན་ནོ། །

What the Autonomists posit this way is very coarse relative to the Consequentialists' apprehension of the object of negation; hence, it is not the innate subtle apprehension of true existence [according to the Consequentialists].

རང་རྒྱུད་པས་འདི་ལྟར་བཞག་པ་ནི། ཐལ་འགྱུར་བའི་དགག་བྱ་འཛིན་པའི་བློ་ལ་ལྟོས་ན་ཤིན་ཏུ་རགས་པས། ཕྲ་བའི་བདེན་འཛིན་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ནི་མིན་ནོ། །

When the true existence apprehended by the apprehension of true existence is refuted through reasoning, one—like the magician—does not apprehend external and internal phenomena as having a mode of abiding that is not posited through the force of

an internal awareness; rather, one understands [external and internal phenomena] as mere existents posited through the force of an awareness. Moreover, those posited through the force of an awareness that are not damaged by valid cognition are asserted as existing in conventional terms; however, everything posited through the force of an awareness is not asserted as existing in conventional terms.

Although the production of a sprout from a seed is posited through the force of an awareness, it is not contradictory that the sprout also is produced from the seed from its own side. This is like the fact that there is an appearance as a horse or an elephant even from the side of the basis of conjuring [that is, a pebble or twig]. Through this, all phenomena existing in conventional terms are to be understood.

Even the noumenon is posited as existing through the force of the awareness to which it appears. Hence, it is not an exception to being posited as existing in conventional terms.

ནམ་ཞིག་བདེན་འཛིན་དེས་བཟུང་བའི་བདེན་གྲུབ་རིགས་པས་ཁེགས་པ་ན་སྒྱུ་མ་མཁན་བཞིན་དུ་ཕྱི་ནང་གི་ཆོས་རྣམས་ལ། ནང་གི་བློའི་དབང་གིས་མ་བཞག་པའི་སྡོད་ལུགས་ཡོད་པར་མི་འཛིན་པར། བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པའི་ཡོད་པ་ཙམ་དུ་ཤེས་པར་འགྱུར་རོ། །དེ་ཡང་ཚད་མས་མི་གནོད་པའི་བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་རྣམས་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་ཡོད་པར་འདོད་ཀྱི། བློའི་དབང་གིས་གང་བཞག་ཐམས་ཅད་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་ཡོད་པར་མི་འདོད་དོ། །ས་བོན་ལས་མྱུ་གུ་སྐྱེ་བ་བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཀྱང་། མྱུ་གུ་རང་གི་ངོས་ནས་ས་བོན་ལས་སྐྱེ་བ་ཡང་མི་འགལ་བ་ནི། སྒྲུལ་གཞིའི་ངོས་ནས་ཀྱང་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་བ་དང་འདྲ་སྟེ། དེས་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་ཡོད་པ་ཐམས་ཅད་ཤེས་པར་བྱའོ། །ཆོས་ཉིད་ཀྱང་རང་གང་ལ་སྣང་བའི་བློའི་དབང་གིས་ཡོད་པར་འཇོག་པས། དེ་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་ཡོད་པར་འཇོག་པ་ལ་མ་ཁྱབ་པ་མེད་དོ། །

Therefore, the significance of applying the example, a magician's illusion, to the meaning—other phenomena—is not at all that just as a magician's illusion appears to be a horse or an elephant but is empty of being such, so all [phenomena] such as pots and so forth appear to be pots and so forth, but are empty of being pots and so forth. For, if that were the case, being that phenomenon [for example, being a pot] would not occur, and the application of the example to the meaning would be that [phenomena] appear to be such-and-such but are not the actual thing.

དེས་ན་སྒྱུ་མ་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་ཡང་དེས་སྟོང་པ་བཞིན་དུ། བུམ་སོགས་ཐམས་ཅད་བུམ་

སོགས་སུ་སྣང་ཡང་བུམ་སོགས་ཀྱིས་སྟོང་པ་ནི། སྒྱུ་མ་དང་ཆོས་གཞན་རྣམས་དཔེ་དོན་དུ་སྦྱོར་བའི་དོན་གཏན་མིན་ཏེ། །དེ་ལྟ་ན་ཆོས་དེ་ཡིན་པ་མི་སྲིད་པར་འགྱུར་ཞིང་། དཔེ་དོན་སྦྱར་བ་ཡང་དེར་སྣང་བ་ཡིན་གྱི་དེ་དངོས་མིན་པར་འགྱུར་བའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །

When non-conceptual pristine wisdom of meditative equipoise is generated, in its perspective all dualistic appearances are quiescent. This is like one whose eyes, not having been affected [by the magician's mantra], have neither the illusory appearance nor adherence to it.

ནམ་ཞིག་མཉམ་གཞག་རྣམ་པར་མི་རྟོག་པའི་ཡེ་ཤེས་སྐྱེས་པ་ན། དེའི་ངོར་གཉིས་སྣང་ཐམས་[74b]ཅད་ཉེ་བར་ཞི་བ་ནི་མིག་མ་བསླད་པ་ལ་སྒྱུ་མའི་སྣང་ཞེན་གཉིས་ཀ་མེད་པ་དང་འདྲའོ། །

Later [in Chandrakīrti's text] there is no indication of the Autonomists' uncommon modes of refuting [true existence] by reasoning; therefore, let us here express briefly and in a way easy to understand how through this system all phenomena are caused to appear as like a magician's illusions.

Objects of knowledge are inclusively divided into the two: effective things and non-effective things [or impermanent and permanent phenomena]. Let us explain this with respect to effective things first. Effective things are inclusively divided into the physical and non-physical. Applying the refutation, as explained elsewhere, of physical things that are directionally partless—eastern direction, and so forth—and of consciousnesses that are temporally partless, [the Autonomists] prove that effective things necessarily have parts. Then, if parts and whole were different entities, they would be unrelated; thereby [a difference of entity of parts and whole] is refuted, and [parts and whole] are shown to be one entity.

At that time, no matter how the mind looks into it, it is undeniable that although the mode of being [of parts and whole] is to be one entity, in their mode of appearance [to thought] they appear to be different entities. Thereby, it is delineated that [effective things] are, like a magician's illusions, a combination of the two—appearing one way and being empty of [existing] that way.

འོག་ནས་རང་རྒྱུད་པས་རིགས་པས་འགོག་ཚུལ་ཐུན་མོང་མ་ཡིན་པ་རྣམས་མི་སྟོན་པས། འདིར་དེའི་ལུགས་ཀྱིས་ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་སྒྱུ་མ་བཞིན་དུ་འཆར་ཚུལ་མདོར་བསྡུས་གོ་སླ་བར་བརྗོད་ན། ཤེས་བྱ་ལ་དངོས་པོར་ཡོད་མེད་གཉིས་སུ་ཁ་ཚོན་ཆོད་པའི་དང་

པོར་དངོས་པོ་ལ་བཤད་ན། དངོས་པོ་ལ་གཟུགས་ཅན་ཡིན་མིན་གཉིས་སུ་ཁ་ཚོན་ཚོད་ཅིང་། གཟུགས་ཅན་ལ་ཤར་ལ་སོགས་པའི་ཕྱོགས་ཀྱི་ཆ་མེད་དང་། ཤེས་པ་ལ་དུས་སྔ་ཕྱིའི་ཆ་མེད་དགག་པ་གཞན་ནས་བཤད་པ་ལྟར་བྱ་ལ། དངོས་པོ་ལ་ཆ་བཅས་ཀྱིས་ཁྱབ་པར་བསྒྲུབ། དེ་ནས་ཆ་དང་ཆ་ཅན་གཉིས་ཀ་ངོ་བོ་ཐ་དད་ན་འབྲེལ་མེད་དུ་འགྱུར་བས་དགག་ལ་ངོ་བོ་གཅིག་ཏུ་བསྟན། དེའི་ཚེ་དེ་ལ་ཡིད་ཇི་ལྟར་གཏད་པ་ན། ཡིན་ཚུལ་ངོ་བོ་གཅིག་ཡིན་ཀྱང་སྣང་ཚུལ་ལ་ངོ་བོ་ཐ་དད་དུ་སྣང་བ་སྐྱོན་དུ་མེད་པས། སྒྱུ་མ་བཞིན་དུ་དེར་སྣང་བ་དང་དེས་སྟོང་པ་གཉིས་ཚོགས་པར་གཏན་ལ་དབབ།

Then, although such is not contradictory in the context of the mode of abiding of a falsity posited through the force of appearing to an awareness, if a certain base [that is, a certain phenomenon] had a mode of subsistence not posited through the force of appearing to an awareness, [such a combination of appearance and emptiness] would not at all be reasonable because discordant modes of abiding and of appearance cannot occur in what is truly established, as was explained earlier, because if something is truly established, it must abide in a manner devoid of falsity in all respects and because [since appearance and mode of being would necessarily be concordant,] the awareness to which [parts and whole] appear as different entities would have to be unmistaken, thereby damaging their being one entity.

དེ་ནས་དེ་འདྲ་དེ་བློ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པའི་བརྫུན་པའི་སྡོད་ལུགས་ལ་འགལ་བ་མེད་ཀྱང་། གཞི་དེ་བློ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་མིན་པའི་སྡོད་ལུགས་ཡིན་ན་གཏན་མི་རིགས་ཏེ། སྔར་བཤད་པའི་བདེན་གྲུབ་ལ་གནས་ཚུལ་དང་སྣང་ཚུལ་མི་མཐུན་པ་མི་སྲིད་པའི་ཕྱིར་ཏེ། བདེན་པར་གྲུབ་ན་རྣམ་པ་ཐམས་ཅད་དུ་བརྫུན་པ་སྤངས་ཏེ་གནས་དགོས་པའི་ཕྱིར་དང་། ངོ་བོ་ཐ་དད་དུ་སྣང་བའི་བློ་དེ་མ་འཁྲུལ་བར་འགྱུར་དགོས་པས་ངོ་བོ་གཅིག་པ་ལ་གནོད་པའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །

Once this is established [with respect to effective things], in dependence on that reasoning it can be refuted that non-effective things are truly established. For, even with respect to uncompounded space, it must be asserted that it pervades certain physical objects, and regarding this it must be asserted that it has a part pervading the east and parts pervading the other directions. Likewise, the noumenon [or emptiness] also has many parts pervading [phenomena], as well as many different parts realized by different former and later awarenesses. Also, other uncompounded [phenomena] are similar. Therefore, since the two—the many parts and

the whole—are not fit to be different entities, they are one entity. Also, that [same discrepancy between modes of being and of appearance] is suitable in a falsity but not suitable in what is truly established. Hence, [the true establishment of uncompounded phenomena] is refuted as before [with compounded phenomena], whereby all objects of knowledge are established to be without true existence. Since this treatment is the assertion of the father Shāntarakṣhita and his spiritual son [Kamalashīla], reckoning part and whole only for effective things is a flaw of those with small intelligence.

དེ་གྲུབ་ན་ནི་དངོས་པོར་མེད་པ་རྣམས་བདེན་པར་གྲུབ་པ་ཡང་རིགས་པ་དེ་ལ་[75a]བརྟེན་ནས་འགོག་ནུས་ཏེ། འདུས་མ་བྱས་ཀྱི་ནམ་མཁའ་ལ་ཡང་གཟུགས་ཅན་འགའ་ཞིག་ལ་ཁྱབ་པ་ཁས་བླང་དགོས་ལ། དེ་ལ་ཡང་ཤར་ལ་ཁྱབ་པའི་ཆ་དང་ཕྱོགས་གཞན་ལ་ཁྱབ་པའི་ཆ་ཁས་བླང་དགོས་སོ། །དེ་བཞིན་དུ་ཆོས་ཉིད་ལ་ཡང་ཁྱབ་པའི་ཆ་དུ་མ་དང་། སྔ་ཕྱི་མ྄ི་ཐ་དད་ཀྱིས་རྟོགས་པའི་ཆ་ཐ་དད་པ་དུ་མ་ཡོད་ལ། འདུས་མ་བྱས་གཞན་ཡང་དེ་དང་འདྲ་བས། ཆ་དུ་མ་དང་ཆ་ཅན་གཉིས་ངོ་བོ་ཐ་དད་མི་རུང་བས་ངོ་བོ་གཅིག་པ་དང་། དེ་བརྫུན་པ་ལ་རུང་གི་བདེན་གྲུབ་ལ་མི་རུང་བས། སྔར་བཞིན་བཀག་པས་ཤེས་བྱ་ཐམས་ཅད་བདེན་མེད་དུ་འགྲུབ་བོ། །དེ་ལྟར་བྱེད་པ་ཞི་བ་འཚོ་ཡབ་སྲས་ཀྱི་བཞེད་པ་ཡིན་པས། ཆ་དང་ཆ་ཅན་དངོས་པོ་ཁོ་ན་ལ་རྩི་བ་ནི་བློ་གྲོས་ཆུང་བའི་སྐྱོན་ནོ། །

The falsity renowned among those whose awarenesses have not been affected by tenets does not have the same meaning as the falsity asserted by the Middle Way School; therefore, although it is posited by an awareness, [this type of being posited by an awareness] is in accordance with how that is renowned to them. However, in the [Autonomists'] own system merely this is not asserted as [the meaning of being] posited by an awareness.

གྲུབ་མཐས་བློ་མ་བསྒྱུར་བ་ལ་གྲགས་པའི་བརྫུན་པ་ནི་དབུ་མ་པ་འདོད་པའི་བརྫུན་པ་དང་དོན་མི་གཅིག་པས་བློས་བཞག་ཀྱང་དེ་དག་ལ་གྲགས་པ་ལྟར་ཡིན་གྱི། རང་ལུགས་ལ་དེ་ཙམ་ལ་བློས་བཞག་ཏུ་མི་འདོད་དོ། །

[Concluding remarks]

In that way, even though there is no mode of subsistence not posited by the force of appearing to an awareness, in this system it is not contradictory for there to be a mode of subsistence that is posited by the force of appearing to an awareness but is not merely

nominally imputed,[a] [whereas such is contradictory in the Consequence School]. Hence, the objects of negation in the two Middle Way Schools come to differ greatly with regard to the perspective of the awareness [in the face of which objects are posited].[b]

Having seen that contemporary persons—who have been briefly instructed well in [the Autonomists'] identification of true [existence] and [their estimation of] the apprehension of true existence as well as [their] reasonings refuting those—discern the Consequentialists' view well when, afterwards, that system is taught, [I] have explained these here.

དེ་ལྟར་ན་བློ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་མིན་པའི་སྡོད་ལུགས་མེད་ཀྱང་། དེའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པའི་སྡོད་ལུགས་མིང་དུ་བཏགས་པ་ཙམ་མིན་པ་ཅིག་ཡོད་པ་ལུགས་འདི་ལ་མི་འགལ་བས། དབུ་མ་པ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་དགག་བྱ་ལ་བློའི་ངོར་མི་འདྲ་བ་ཆེན་པོ་འོང་ངོ་། །དེ་ལྟར་གྱི་གང་ཟག་ལ་ལུགས་འདིའི་བདེན་པ་དང་བདེན་འཛིན་གྱི་ངོས་འཛིན་དང་། དེ་འགོག་པའི་རིགས་པ་མདོར་བསྡུས་ལ་ལེགས་པར་ཁྲིད་ནས། དེའི་འོག་ཏུ་ཐལ་འགྱུར་བའི་ལུགས་བསྟན་ན་ལྟ་བ་དམིགས་ལེགས་པར་ཕྱེད་པར་མཐོང་ནས་]འདིར་བཤད་པ་ཡིན་ནོ་ཞེས་བྱུང་།

a. Decisive Analysis {3 parts}

This section has three parts: refutation [of mistakes (*'khrul pa dgag pa*)[c]], positing [our own system (*rang lugs gzhag pa*)], and dispelling [objections to that (*de la rtsod pa spangs pa*)].

མཐའ་དཔྱད་པ་ལ་དགག་གཞག་སྤང་གསུམ་ལས།

1) REFUTATION [OF MISTAKES]

[དང་པོ་འཁྲུལ་པ་དགག་པ་ནི་]

---

[a] *ming tu btags pa tsam min pa.*

[b] For the Autonomists the awareness is any consciousness, either conceptual or non-conceptual, not affected by superficial causes of mistake, whereas for the Consequentialists it must be only conceptual since everything is only imputedly existent.

[c] This is also called "refutation of other systems" (*gzhan lugs dgag pa*).

1. Some earlier Tibetan Proponents of the Middle Way and some Proponents of the Doctrines of Maitreya*[a] *say: That which withstands analysis by a rational consciousness is an object of negation, and that which withstands analysis by a rational consciousness and object found by that [rational consciousness] are [hypothetically][b] equivalent.

སྔོན་གྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་དབུ་མ་པ་དང་བྱམས་ཆོས་པ་ཁ་ཅིག་ན་རེ། རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱི་དཔྱད་བཟོད་དགག་བྱ་དང་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱི་དཔྱད་བཟོད་དང་[རིགས་ཤེས་]དེའི་རྙེད་དོན་དོན་གཅིག་ཟེར།

Our response: Well, it [absurdly] follows that the subject, the noumenon,[c] is an object of negation because of being an object found by a rational consciousness analyzing the ultimate. You have asserted the entailment [that whatever is an object found by a rational consciousness analyzing the ultimate is necessarily an object of negation]. The reason [which is that the noumenon is an object found by a rational consciousness analyzing the ultimate] is established because Chandrakīrti's *Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle"* says, "Objects of perceptions of reality are suchnesses."

འོ་ན། ཆོས་ཉིད་ཆོས་ཅན། དགག་བྱར་ཐལ། དོན་དམ་དཔྱོད་པའི་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱི་རྙེད་དོན་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [དོན་དམ་དཔྱོད་པའི་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱི་རྙེད་དོན་ཡིན་ན་དགག་བྱ་ཡིན་པས་]ཁྱབ་པ་ཁས། [ཆོས་ཉིད་དོན་དམ་དཔྱོད་པའི་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱི་རྙེད་དོན་ཡིན་པ་]རྟགས་གྲུབ་སྟེ། རྩ་བར། ཡང་དག་མཐོང་ཡུལ་གང་དེ་དེ[255]ཉིད་དང་། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

---

[a] Ngag-wang-leg-dan: Maitreya's *Ornament for the Clear Realizations* and so forth.

[b] Here, "hypothetically" means holding an extreme for the sake of analysis (*brtags pa mtha' bzung*)—hypothetical analysis. Since whatever is equivalent necessarily exists but nothing withstands analysis by a rational consciousness and nothing is found by a rational consciousness, when Jam-yang-shay-pa says that the latter two are equivalent, this is only hypothetically or heuristically stated. See Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound: Jam-yang-shay-ba's Great Exposition of Buddhist and Non-Buddhist Views on the Nature of Reality,* 738.

[c] Here, the term noumenon means the final reality, as this is its prime dictionary definition. Although this term is used to translate Kant's "Ding an sich," or "thing-in-itself," that is not its meaning here.

2. Also, someone says: The noumenon is not an object of knowledge because if something is an object of a rational consciousness, it becomes able to withstand analysis.

ཡང་ཁ་ཅིག་ན་རེ། ཆོས་ཉིད་ཤེས་བྱ་མ་ཡིན་ཏེ། དེ་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱི་ཡུལ་ཡིན་ན་དཔྱད་བཟོད་དུ་འགྲོ་བའི་ཕྱིར་ཟེར་ན།

Our response: Well, it [absurdly] follows that it is not logically feasible for [Chandrakīrti] to say "Objects of perceptions of reality" because [according to you your] thesis [that the noumenon is not an object of knowledge] is logically feasible."

འོ་ན། ཡང་དག་མཐོང་ཡུལ་ཞེས་གསུངས་པ་མི་འཐད་པར་ཐལ། [ཆོས་ཉིད་ཤེས་བྱ་མ་ཡིན་པའི་]དམ་བཅའ་འཐད་པའི་ཕྱིར།

3. Moreover, the early sovereign of proponents of reasoning Cha-pa [Chö-kyi-seng-ge][a] and later Jo-nang-pa She-rab-gyal-tshan,[b] Shākya-chog-dan,[c] Go-ram-pa Sö-nam-seng-ge,[d] and the [Eighth] Kar-ma-pa Mi-kyö-dor-je[e] say: It follows that the noumenon is ultimately established because the measure of ultimately existing is taken to be "established as existent by a rational consciousness comprehending suchness," because Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle* says:[f]

> The statement that "Ultimately production does not exist" should be explained as "These are not established by a consciousness of reality as produced."

ཡང་སྔོན་[187a]གྱི་རིགས་སྨྲའི་དབང་པོ་ཆ་པ་དང་ཕྱིས་ཀྱི་ཇོ་ཤཱཀ་གོ་ཀར་རྣམས་ན་རེ། ཆོས་ཉིད་དོན་དམ་པར་གྲུབ་པར་ཐལ། དོན་དམ་པར་ཡོད་པའི་ཚད་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་འཇལ་བའི་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱིས་ཡོད་པར་གྲུབ་པ་ལ་བྱེད་པའི་ཕྱིར། དབུ་མ་སྣང་བ་ལས།

---

[a] *phywa pa chos kyi seng ge,* 1109-1169.
[b] *dol po pa shes rab rgyal mtshan,* 1292-1361.
[c] *shākya mchog ldan,* 1428-1507.
[d] *go rams pa bsod nams seng ge,* 1429-1489.
[e] *kar ma pa mi dkyod rdo rje,* 1507-1554.
[f] Kamalashīla, *dbu ma snang ba,* 229b.3.

དོན་དམ་པར་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་དོ། །ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ནི་འདི་དག་ཡང་དག་པའི་ཤེས་པས་སྐྱེ་བར་མ་གྲུབ་བོ། །ཞེས་བཤད་པར་འགྱུར་རོ་ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: [Kamalashīla's saying in the *Illumination of the Middle* "The statement that 'Ultimately production does not exist' should be explained as 'These are not established by a consciousness of reality as produced'"] does not entail [that the measure of ultimately existing is taken to be "established as existent by a rational consciousness comprehending suchness"].

[དབུ་མ་སྣང་བ་ལས། དོན་དམ་པར་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་དོ། །ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ནི་འདི་དག་ཡང་དག་པའི་ཤེས་པས་སྐྱེ་བར་མ་གྲུབ་བོ། །ཞེས་བཤད་པར་འགྱུར་རོ་ཞེས་གསུངས་ན་དོན་དམ་པར་ཡོད་པའི་ཚད་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་འཇལ་བའི་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱིས་ཡོད་པར་གྲུབ་པ་ལ་བྱེད་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ།

[Opponent:] It follows that [Kamalashīla's saying in the *Illumination of the Middle* "The statement that 'Ultimately production does not exist' should be explained as 'These are not established by a consciousness of reality as produced'"] entails [that the measure of ultimately existing is taken to be "established as existent by a rational consciousness comprehending suchness"] because that scriptural passage [from Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle*], having explicitly explained that the non-establishment of production and so forth as objects of a rational consciousness is the meaning of their ultimate non-establishment, implicitly indicates that the establishment of production and so forth as objects of a rational consciousness is the ultimate establishment of production and so forth.

དེ་ལ་[དབུ་མ་སྣང་བ་ལས། དོན་དམ་པར་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་དོ། །ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ནི་འདི་དག་ཡང་དག་པའི་ཤེས་པས་སྐྱེ་བར་མ་གྲུབ་བོ། །ཞེས་བཤད་པར་འགྱུར་རོ་ཞེས་གསུངས་ན་དོན་དམ་པར་ཡོད་པའི་ཚད་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་འཇལ་བའི་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱིས་ཡོད་པར་གྲུབ་པ་ལ་བྱེད་པས་]ཁྱབ་པར་ཐལ། [དབུ་མ་སྣང་བའི་]ལུང་དེས་སྐྱེ་སོགས་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱི་ཡུལ་དུ་མ་གྲུབ་པ་ནི་དེ་དག་དོན་དམ་པར་མ་གྲུབ་པའི་དོན་དུ་དངོས་སུ་བཤད་ནས་ཤུགས་ལ་སྐྱེ་སོགས་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱི་

ཡུལ་དུ་གྲུབ་པ་སྐྱེ་སོགས་དོན་དམ་པར་གྲུབ་པར་བསྟན་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་ཡང་།

Our response: Nevertheless, [that this scriptural passage, having explicitly explained that the non-establishment of production and so forth as objects of a rational consciousness is the meaning of their ultimate non-establishment, implicitly indicates that the establishment of production and so forth as objects of a rational consciousness is the ultimate establishment of production and so forth] does not entail [that Kamalashīla's saying in the *Illumination of the Middle* "The statement that 'Ultimately production does not exist' should be explained as 'These are not established by a consciousness of reality as produced'"] entails that the measure of ultimately existing is taken to be "established as existent by a rational consciousness comprehending suchness"].

[ལུང་དེས་སྐྱེ་སོགས་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱི་ཡུལ་དུ་མ་གྲུབ་པ་ནི་དེ་དག་དོན་དམ་པར་མ་གྲུབ་པའི་དོན་དུ་དངོས་སུ་བཤད་ནས་ཤུགས་ལ་སྐྱེ་སོགས་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱི་ཡུལ་དུ་གྲུབ་པ་སྐྱེ་སོགས་དོན་དམ་པར་གྲུབ་པར་བསྟན་ན་དབུ་མ་སྣང་བ་ལས། དོན་དམ་པར་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་དོ། །ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ནི་འདི་དག་ཡང་དག་པའི་ཤེས་པས་སྐྱེ་བར་མ་གྲུབ་བོ། །ཞེས་བཤད་པར་འགྱུར་རོ་ཞེས་གསུངས་ན་དོན་དམ་པར་ཡོད་པའི་ཚད་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་འཇལ་བའི་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱིས་ཡོད་པར་གྲུབ་པ་ལ་བྱེད་པས་ཁྱབ་པ་ཡོད་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ།

If you accept [that Kamalashīla's saying in the *Illumination of the Middle* "The statement that 'Ultimately production does not exist' should be explained as 'These are not established by a consciousness of reality as produced'" entails[a] that the measure of ultimately existing is taken to be "established as existent by a rational consciousness comprehending suchness], it [absurdly] follows that it is reasonable to explain that, in the dispute about ultimately established or not ultimately established, (1) "the ultimate" is[b] *only* a rational consciousness and (2) ultimately established or not ultimately established is only to be established or not to be established in the face of that rational consciousness because [according to you] your innermost assertion (*zhe 'dod*) [that the measure of ultimately existing is taken to be "established as existent by a rational consciousness comprehending suchness] is logically feasible.

[a] An alternative translation would be "requires."

[b] That is, "means."

[དབུ་མ་སྣང་བ་ལས། དོན་དམ་པར་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་དོ། །ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ནི་འདི་དག་ཡང་དག་པའི་ཤེས་པས་སྐྱེ་བར་མ་གྲུབ་བོ། །ཞེས་བཤད་པར་འགྱུར་རོ་ཞེས་གསུངས་ན་དོན་དམ་པར་ཡོད་པའི་ཚད་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་འཇལ་བའི་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱིས་ཡོད་པར་གྲུབ་པ་ལ་བྱེད་པས་ཁྱབ་པར་]འདོད་ན། དོན་དམ་པར་གྲུབ་མ་གྲུབ་རྩོད་པའི་དོན་དམ་དེ་རིགས་ཤེས་དང་དོན་དམ་དུ་གྲུབ་མ་གྲུབ་རིགས་ཤེས་དེའི་ངོར་གྲུབ་མ་གྲུབ་ཁོ་ན་ལ་འཆད་རིགས་པར་ཐལ། ཁྱོད་དག་གི་ཞེ་འདོད་[དོན་དམ་པར་ཡོད་པའི་ཚད་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་འཇལ་བའི་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱིས་ཡོད་པར་གྲུབ་པ་ལ་བྱེད་པ་འདི་]འཐད་པའི་ཕྱིར།

If you accept [that it is reasonable to explain that, in the dispute about ultimately established or not ultimately established, (1) "the ultimate" in ultimately established or not ultimately established is only a rational consciousness and (2) ultimately being established or ultimately not being established is *only* to be established or not to be established in the face of that rational consciousness], it [absurdly] follows that phenomena ranging from forms through omniscient consciousnesses each are not similar in being ultimately non-established and being conventionally existent because [according to you] the eighteen emptinesses[a] are ultimately established. [You] have come to accept the reason [which is that the eighteen

---

[a] The eighteen emptinesses are:

1. emptiness of the internal, that is, of the five senses (*nang stong pa nyid, adhyātmaśūnyatā*)
2. emptiness of the external, that is, of the six types of objects which are the objects of the five senses and of the mental consciousness (*phyi stong pa nyid, bahirdhāśūnyatā*)
3. emptiness of the internal and external, that is, of the loci of the senses, the gross orbs of the eyes, and so forth (*phyi nang stong pa nyid, adhyātmabahirdhāśūnyatā*)
4. emptiness of emptiness, that is, of the emptiness that is the nature of phenomena (*stong pa nyid stong pa nyid, śūnyatāśūnyatā*)
5. emptiness of the great, that is, of the ten directions (*chen po stong pa nyid, mahāśūnyatā*).
6. emptiness of the ultimate, that is, of nirvāṇa (*don dam pa stong pa nyid, paramārthaśūnyatā*)
7. emptiness of the compounded (*'dus byas stong pa nyid, saṃskṛtaśūnyatā*)
8. emptiness of uncompounded (*'dus ma byas stong pa nyid, asaṃskṛtaśūnyatā*)
9. emptiness of what has passed beyond the extremes, that is, of what is free of the extremes of permanence and annihilation (*mtha' las 'das pa stong pa nyid, atyanta-śūnyatā*)

emptiness are ultimately established].
[དོན་དམ་པར་གྲུབ་མ་གྲུབ་རྩོད་པའི་དོན་དམ་དེ་རིགས་གཉིས་དང་དོན་དམ་དུ་གྲུབ་མ་གྲུབ་རིགས་གཉིས་དེའི་ངོར་གྲུབ་མ་གྲུབ་ཁོ་ན་ལ་འཆད་རིགས་པར་]འདོད་ན། གཟུགས་ནས་རྣམ་མཁྱེན་བར་གྱི་ཆོས་རྣམས་རེ་རེ་ནས་དོན་དམ་པར་མ་གྲུབ་པ་དང་། ཐ་སྙད་དུ་ཡོད་མཚུངས་མ་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། སྟོང་ཉིད་བཅོ་བརྒྱད་དོན་དམ་པར་གྲུབ་པའི་ཕྱིར། [སྟོང་ཉིད་བཅོ་བརྒྱད་དོན་དམ་པར་གྲུབ་པའི་]རྟགས་སོང་།

You cannot assert [that phenomena ranging from forms through omniscient consciousnesses each are not similar in being ultimately non-established and being conventionally existent] because in the description that, without distinction, all phenomena are not ultimately existent, both "the ultimate" and "established ultimately"[a] are nonexistent. It follows that

10. emptiness of what is beginningless and endless, that is, of cyclic existence (*thog ma dang tha ma med pa stong pa nyid, anavarāgraśūnyatā*)
11. emptiness of the indestructible, that is, of the indestructible Mahāyāna (*dor ba med pa stong pa nyid, anavakāraśūnyatā*)
12. emptiness of nature, that is, of the emptinesses which are the nature of phenomena (*rang bzhin stong pa nyid, prakṛtiśūnyatā*)
13. emptiness of all phenomena, that is, of the eighteen constituents, etc. (*chos thams cad stong pa nyid, sarvadharmaśūnyatā*)
14. emptiness of definitions, that is, of the definitions of all phenomena from forms through to omniscient consciousnesses (*rang gi mtshan nyid stong pa nyid, lakṣaṇaśūnyatā*)
15. emptiness of the unapprehendable, that is, of the past, present, and future which are unapprehendable as the cessation of phenomena, their presence, and their non-production (*mi dmigs pa stong pa nyid, anupalambhaśūnyatā*)
16. emptiness of the inherent existence of non-things, that is, of inherently existent non-products (*dngos po med pa'i ngo bo nyid stong pa nyid, abhāvasvabhāśūnyatā*)
17. emptiness of things, that is, of the five aggregates (*dngos po med pa stong pa nyid, bhāvaśūnyatā*)
18. emptiness of non-things, that is, of non-products (*ngo bo nyid stong pa nyid, abhāvaśūnyatā*).

See Hopkins, *Meditation on Emptiness,* 204-205.

[a] As will be explained below, here ultimate means "its own uncommon mode of abiding without being posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness" (*blo gnod med la snang ba'i dbang gis bzhag pa ma yin par rang gi mthun mong ma yin pa'i sdod lugs*), and established ultimately means "established by way of its own uncommon mode of abiding without being posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness" (*blo gnod med la snang ba'i dbang gis bzhag pa ma yin par rang gi mthun*

[in the description that, without distinction, all phenomena are not ultimately existent, both "the ultimate" and "established ultimately" are non-existent,] because those [that is, "the ultimate" and "established ultimately,"] must be taken as the "true establishment" that is drawn out by way of the opposite of "existent in conventional terms" of the Proponents of the Middle Way.

[གཟུགས་ནས་རྣམ་མཁྱེན་བར་གྱི་ཆོས་རྣམས་རེ་རེ་ནས་དོན་དམ་པར་མ་གྲུབ་པ་དང་། ཐ་སྙད་དུ་ཡོད་མཚུངས་མ་ཡིན་པར་]འདོད་མི་ནུས་ཏེ། ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་ལ་ཁྱད་པར་མེད་པར་དོན་དམ་པར་མེད་པར་བཤད་པའི་དོན་དམ་པ་དང་དེར་གྲུབ་པ་གཉིས་ཀ་མེད་པའི་ཕྱིར། [ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་ལ་ཁྱད་པར་མེད་པར་དོན་དམ་པར་མེད་པར་བཤད་པའི་དོན་དམ་པ་དང་དེར་གྲུབ་པ་གཉིས་ཀ་མེད་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། [དོན་དམ་པ་དང་དོན་དམ་པར་གྲུབ་པ་]དེ་ནི་དབུ་མ་པའི་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་ཡོད་པའི་ཟློས་ཟློག་[187b]པའི་བདེན་གྲུབ་ལ་བྱེད་དགོས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

It follows that ["the ultimate" and "established ultimately" must be taken as the "true establishment" that is drawn out by way of the opposite of "existent in conventional terms" of the Proponents of the Middle Way] because it is reasonable to posit that the object of apprehension of true existence is the meaning of "the ultimate" and that establishment as that [that is to say, as truly existent] is the meaning of " established ultimately," because a Mother Sūtra [a Perfection of Wisdom] says:

> Moreover, Bodhisattvas, Mahāsattvas, in dependence on imputation by the world will manifestly and completely bring about the full purification of unsurpassable thoroughly complete enlightenment, but, ultimately, whatsoever deeds in order to achieve enlightenment [and] forms (*gzugs, rūpa*), feelings (*tshor ba, vedanā*), discriminations (*'du shes, saṃjñā*), compositional factors (*'du byed, saṃskāra*), and consciousnesses (*rnam par shes pa, vijñāna*) do not even slightly exist. Likewise, the eighteen constituents, the six contacts,…the four fruits, the knowledge of the path (*lam shes pa, margajñāna*), and even the unsurpassable thor-

---

mong ma yin pa'i sdod lugs kyi ngos nas grub pa).

oughly complete enlightenment do not exist; for all these phenomena are imputed depending upon worldly conventions, but not ultimately."

[དོན་དམ་པ་དང་དོན་དམ་པར་གྲུབ་པ་དེ་ནི་དབུ་མ་པའི་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་ཡོད་པའི་ཟླས་དྲངས་པའི་བདེན་གྲུབ་ལ་ཕྱེད་དགོས་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། བདེན་འཛིན་གྱི་ཡུལ་དེ་དོན་དམ་དང་དེར་གྲུབ་པ་དོན་དམ་དུ་གྲུབ་པའི་དོན་དུ་འཇོག་རིགས་པའི་ཕྱིར། ཡུམ་ལས། ཡང་བྱང་ཆུབ་སེམས་དཔའ་སེམས་དཔའ་ཆེན་པོ་ནི་འཇིག་རྟེན་གྱིས་བཏགས་པ་ལ་བརྟེན་ནས་བླ་ན་མེད་པ་ཡང་དག་པར་རྫོགས་པའི་བྱང་ཆུབ་མངོན་པར་རྫོགས་པར་འཚང་རྒྱ་བར་བྱ་ཡི། དོན་དམ་པར་ནི་གང་བྱང་ཆུབ་པར་བྱ་བའི་ཕྱིར་སྤྱོད་པར་འགྱུར་བ་གཟུགས་སམ་ཚོར་བའམ་འདུ་ཤེས་སམ་འདུ་བྱེད་དམ་རྣམ་པར་[256]ཤེས་པ་གང་ཅུང་ཟད་ཀྱང་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་ལ། དེ་བཞིན་དུ་ཁམས་བཅོ་བརྒྱད་དང་རེག་པ་དྲུག་དང་། ཞེས་པ་ནས། འབྲས་བུ་བཞི་དང་ལམ་ཤེས་པ་ཉིད་དང་བླ་ན་མེད་པ་ཡང་དག་པར་རྫོགས་པའི་བྱང་ཆུབ་ཀྱང་མེད་དེ། ཆོས་འདི་དག་ཐམས་ཅད་ནི་འཇིག་རྟེན་གྱི་ཐ་སྙད་ལ་བརྟེན་ནས་བཏགས་ཀྱི་དོན་དམ་པར་ནི་མ་ཡིན་ནོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

[This passage from a Mother Sūtra] entails that [it is reasonable to posit that the object of apprehension of true existence is the meaning of "the ultimate" and that establishment as that (that is to say, as truly existent) is the meaning of "established ultimately,"] because this scriptural passage [from a Mother Sūtra] describes—as ultimate existence—existence that is not existence in conventional terms, and one should differentiate that "both such an ultimate and establishment that way do not exist, but both 'the ultimate' when a rational consciousness is taken as the ultimate and its objects' establishment in the face of that ultimate exist."

[ཡུམ་ལས་དེ་གསུངས་པ་ཡིན་ན་བདེན་འཛིན་གྱི་ཡུལ་དེ་དོན་དམ་དང་དེར་གྲུབ་པ་དོན་དམ་དུ་གྲུབ་པའི་དོན་དུ་འཇོག་རིགས་པས་]ཁྱབ་སྟེ། [ཡུམ་གྱི་]ལུང་འདིས་ནི་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་པའི་ཡོད་པ་དེ་དོན་དམ་པར་ཡོད་པར་བཤད་ལ་དེ་འདྲའི་དོན་དམ་དང་དེར་གྲུབ་པ་གཉིས་ཀ་མེད་ལ། རིགས་ཤེས་ལ་དོན་དམ་དུ་བྱས་པའི་དོན་དམ་དང་དེའི་ཡུལ་དོན་དམ་དེར་གྲུབ་པ་གཉིས་ཀ་ཡོད་ཅེས་ཁྱད་འབྱེད་དགོས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

It follows that [this scriptural passage from a Mother Sūtra describes—as ultimate existence—existence that is not existence in conventional terms, and one should differentiate that "both such an ultimate and establishment that way do not exist, but both 'the ultimate' when a rational consciousness is taken as the ultimate and its objects' establishment in the face of that ultimate exist"] because if one does not know how to differentiate such, those previous fallacies come,

[ཡུམ་གྱི་ལུང་འདིས་ནི་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་པའི་ཡོད་པ་དེ་དོན་དམ་པར་ཡོད་པར་བཤད་ལ་དེ་འདྲའི་དོན་དམ་དང་དེར་གྲུབ་པ་གཉིས་ཀ་མེད་ལ། རིགས་ཤེས་ལ་དོན་དམ་དུ་བྱས་པའི་དོན་དམ་དང་དེའི་ཡུལ་དོན་དམ་དེར་གྲུབ་པ་གཉིས་ཀ་ཡོད་ཅེས་ཁྱད་འབྱེད་དགོས་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། དེ་ལྟར་འབྱེད་མ་ཤེས་ན་སྔར་གྱི་སྐྱོན་དེ་དག་འོངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

because Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation [of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'"]* says:[a]

> You need to understand that the qualification "ultimately" is affixed in two ways to the object of negation:
>
> 1. Rational consciousnesses of hearing, thinking, and meditating are taken as the ultimate [consciousness], and what is not established by them [is not ultimately established, that is to say, not established for an ultimate consciousness], as described [by Kamalashīla just] above.

[a] Hopkins, *Tsong-kha-pa's Final Exposition of Wisdom,* 193.

2. Existing in an objective mode of abiding without being posited through the force of an awareness is posited as [the meaning of] ultimately existing [and not existing this way is posited as the meaning of not being ultimately established].

The first of these two ultimates [that is, a rational consciousness of hearing, thinking, or meditating], as well as something that is established in its perspective [namely, emptiness], exists. However, both the latter ultimate [that is, existence in an objective mode of abiding without being posited through the force of an awareness] and something that exists that way do not occur. Therefore, although whatever exists ultimately in the latter sense would exist ultimately in the former sense, the apprehension of the former type of existence [that is, the apprehension that an object is established for a rational consciousness] is not an innate apprehension of true existence. To have such an [innate] apprehension of true existence, one must apprehend the latter type of existence [that is, one must apprehend that an object has an objective mode of abiding not posited through the force of an awareness].

Not differentiating these [two meanings of "ultimate"], many have held that the measure of the object of negation is "that which is able to bear reasoned analysis" or "a thing able to bear analysis." In dependence upon this, it appears that many mistakes asserting that ultimate truths are not established bases [that is, do not exist] or that ultimate truths are truly established have arisen. If these [facts] are understood well, you will understand the essential points that the statements that "[the noumenon] does not exist as [its own] basic disposition" and that "[the noumenon] does not exist ultimately" do not contradict the assertion that the noumenon exists and the proposition that it is the basic disposition [of phenomena] and is the ultimate.[a]

རྣམ་བཤད་ལས། དགག་བྱ་ལ་དོན་དམ་གྱི་ཁྱད་པར་སྦྱར་བའི་དོན་དམ་ལ་གཉིས་ཤེས་དགོས་ཏེ། ཞེས་པ་ནས། [ཐོས་བསམ་སྒོམ་གསུམ་གྱི་རིགས་ཤེས་ལ་དོན་དམ་དུ་བྱས་ནས། དེས་ཐར་བཤད་པ་ལྟར་མ་གྲུབ་པ་གཅིག་དང་། བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་མིན་པར་དོན་གྱི་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་ཡོད་པ་ལ།

[a] The ellipsis (*zhes pa nas*) in Jam-yang-shay-pa's text is replaced with the actual content from Tsong-kha-pa's text. The Tibetan: Tsong-kha-pa-blo-bzang-grags-pa, *dgongs pa rab gsal,* 131:15-132:8.

དོན་དམ་དུ་ཡོད་པར་བཞག་པ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་དང་པོའི་དོན་དམ་དང་། དེའི་ངོར་གྲུབ་པ་ཡང་ཡོད་ལ། ཕྱི་མའི་དོན་དམ་དང་དེར་ཡོད་པ་གཉིས་ཀ་ཡང་མི་སྲིད་དོ། །དེས་ན་ཕྱི་མའི་དོན་དམ་དུ་ཡོད་པ་ལ་སྔ་མའི་དོན་དམ་དུ་ཡོད་པས་ཁྱབ་ཀྱང་། སྔ་མའི་ཡོད་འཛིན་ནི་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཀྱི་བདེན་འཛིན་མིན་ལ། དེའི་བདེན་འཛིན་ལ་ནི་ཕྱི་མའི་ཡོད་འཛིན་དགོས་སོ། །འདི་མ་ཕྱེད་པར་དགག་བྱའི་ཚད་འཛིན་རིགས་པས་དཔྱད་བཟོད་དང་། དཔྱད་བཟོད་ཀྱི་དངོས་པོ་ལ་འཛིན་པ་མང་དུ་བྱུང་ཞིང་། དེ་ལ་བརྟེན་ནས་དོན་དམ་བདེན་པ་གཞི་མ་གྲུབ་དང་། བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་འདོད་པའི་ནོར་པ་མང་དུ་བྱུང་སྣང་ངོ་། །འདི་ལེགས་པར་ཤེས་ན་གཞུང་ལུགས་ལ་དང་། དོན་དམ་དུ་མེད་ཟེར་བ་དང་། ཡང་ཆོས་ཉིད་ཡོད་པར་འདོད་ཅིང་དེ་ཉིད་གཞུང་ལུགས་དང་དོན་དམ་ཡིན་པར་སྨྲ་བ་མི་འགལ་བའི་]གནད་རྣམས་ཤེས་[188a]པར་འགྱུར་རོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར་དང་།

and because Khay-drub's *Opening the Eyes of the Fortunate* also says:[a]

> Knowing that on the occasions of both the Autonomy and the Consequence schools there are two modes of positing the ultimate in "ultimately not existent" is very important…Both [that is to say, in the description that, without distinction, all phenomena are not ultimately existent, both "the ultimate" and " ultimately established"] do not exist.

སྐལ་བཟང་མིག་འབྱེད་ལས་ཀྱང་། དོན་དམ་པར་མེད་ཅེས་པའི་དོན་དམ་ལ་འཇོག་ཚུལ་གཉིས་ཡོད་པ་ཐལ་རང་གཉིས་ཀའི་སྐབས་སུ་ཤེས་པ་གནད་དུ་ཆེ་སྟེ། ཞེས་པ་ནས། གཉིས་ཀ་མི་སྲིད་དོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

4. Also, another partisan[b] ***says:*** It follows that it is not logically feasible

[a] José Ignacio Cabezón, *A Dose of Emptiness: an Annotated Translation of the sTong thun chen mo of mKhas-grub dGe-legs-dpal-bzang,* SUNY Series in Buddhist Studies (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992), 140.

[b] The "partisan," or partisans, are Jay-tsün Chö-kyi-gyal-tshan of the Jay College of Se-ra Monastery and Gung-ru Chö-jung, the author of the old textbooks of Go-mang College, discussed briefly earlier (see 23); for detailed information about them, see Jongbok Yi, "Controversy among Ge-lug-pa Scholars about What is Negated in Emptiness according

that the measure of ultimate establishment is not clearly explained in reliable texts of the Autonomy School except for Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle* because both the measure of conventional establishment and the measure of ultimate establishment are indicated by this statement in Jñānagarbha's *Differentiation of the Two Truths:*[a]

> Only these appearances to awarenesses are
> Conventional; the others are the counterpart.[b]

Moreover, Je-drung Shay-rab-wang-po's[c] [work] on the Middle [that is, *General Meaning of the Middle: Further Clarification of the Thought of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement"*][d] says, "Such a teaching is good," but some of our own later scholars have said "[This should be] analyzed."

ཡང་གཞན་ཕྱོགས་པ་ཁ་ཅིག་ན་རེ། དབུ་མ་སྣང་བ་མ་གཏོགས་པའི་རང་རྒྱུད་པའི་གཞུང་ཁུངས་ཐུབ་ནས་དོན་དམ་དུ་གྲུབ་ཚད་གསལ་བར་མ་བཤད་པ་མི་འཐད་པར་ཐལ། བདེན་གཉིས་ལས། བློ་ལ་སྣང་བ་འདི་ཁོ་ན། །ཀུན་རྫོབ་གཞན་ནི་ཅིག་ཤོས་སོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པ་འདིས་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་གྲུབ་ཚད་དང་དོན་དམ་དུ་གྲུབ་

to the Svātantrika-Mādhyamika School," in *Journal of Buddhist Philosophy*, (forthcoming).

[a] *bden gnyis rnam par 'byed pa, satyadvayavibhāṅga.*

[b] According to Jam-yang-shay-pa this half stanza means:

> Only these appearances to awarenesses are
> Conventional [truths]; the others are the counterpart [that is to say, ultimate truths].

According to Jam-yang-shay-pa, "*cig shos,* counterpart" is the counterpart of conventional truths, that is, ultimate truth. However, for the opponent, "*cig shos,* counterpart" is the counterpart of appearances (*snang ba*), that is, the non-appearing. Hence, the opponent thinks that these two lines say that the measure of ultimate establishment (*don dam par grub tshad*) does not appear to shepherdesses and above. This means that the object of negation does not appear to their sense consciousnesses.

[c] *rje drung shes rab dbang po,* 1500-1586; a direct disciple of Se-ra Je-tsün Chö-kyi-gyal-tshan (*se ra rje btsun chos kyi rgyal mtshan,* 1469-1544).

[d] *dbu ma'i spyi don dgongs pa yang gsal*, TBRC W14081. For a detailed introduction with table of contents see Tshul-'khrim-bsKal-bzang, *An Introduction to rJe drung Shes rab dbang po's dGongs pa yang gsal: A Textbook (yig cha) for the Study of Madhyamaka of Byes pa College of Se ra Monastery,* Otani University Collection No. 13957 (Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co., 1992).

ཚད་གཉིས་ཀ་བསྟན་པའི་ཕྱིར་ཟེར་ལ། རྗེ་དྲུང་ཤེས་རབ་དབང་པོའི་དབུ་མར་ཡང་དེ་ལྟར་བསྟན་པ་ལེགས་ཞེས་གསུངས་ཤིང་། ཕྱིས་ཀྱི་རང་རེའི་མཁས་པ་འགའ་ཞིག་གིས་དཔྱད་གསུངས་སོ།།

Our response to that: Well then, it [absurdly] follows that the statement in that passage "Only these appearances to awarenesses are/ Conventional" explains that "The conventionally established are only appearances to awarenesses of shepherdesses and above," and the remainder [that is, "the others are the counterpart"] indicates that the measure of ultimate establishment does not appear to shepherdesses and so forth because [according to you] those "awarenesses" are taken to be awarenesses of shepherdesses and above, and the counterpart of "appearances (*snang*)" is taken to be the non-appearing (*mi snang ba*) [to shepherdesses and so forth], and those two [parts of Jñānagarbha's statement] are taken as the two measures of establishment by you. It is easy to establish the reason [which is that according to you those "awarenesses" are taken to be awarenesses of shepherdesses and above, and the counterpart of "appearances" is taken to be the non-appearing to shepherdesses and so forth, and those two parts of Jñānagarbha's statement are taken as the two measures of establishment by you].

དེ་ལ་འོ་ན། ལུང་དེའི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཅེས་པ་ཡན་ཆད་ཀྱིས་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་གྲུབ་པ་ནི་བ་ལང་རྫི་ཡན་ཆད་ཀྱི་བློ་ལ་སྣང་བ་འདི་ཁོ་ན་ཡིན་ལ། ཞེས་བཤད་པ་དང་། [གཞན་ནི་ཅིག་ཤོས་སོ་ཞེས་པའི་]ལྷག་མས་ནི་དོན་དམ་དུ་གྲུབ་ཚད་བ་ལང་རྫི་སོགས་ལ་མི་སྣང་བར་བསྟན་པར་ཐལ། བློ་དེ་བ་ལང་རྫི་ཡན་ཆད་ཀྱི་བློ་ལ་བྱེད། སྣང་ཞེས་པའི་ཅིག་ཤོས་མི་སྣང་བ་ལ་བྱེད་ཅིང་། ཁྱོད་ཀྱིས་དེ་གཉིས་གྲུབ་ཚད་གཉིས་ལ་སྦྱོར་བའི་ཕྱིར། [བློ་དེ་བ་ལང་རྫི་ཡན་ཆད་ཀྱི་བློ་ལ་བྱེད། སྣང་ཞེས་པའི་ཅིག་ཤོས་མི་སྣང་བ་ལ་བྱེད་ཅིང་། ཁྱོད་ཀྱིས་དེ་གཉིས་གྲུབ་ཚད་གཉིས་ལ་སྦྱོར་བའི་]རྟགས་[257]སླ།

If you accept [that the statement in that passage "Only these appearances to awarenesses are/ Conventional" explains that "the conventionally

established are only appearances to awarenesses of shepherdesses and above, and…," and the remainder [that is, "the others are the other ones"] indicates that the measure of ultimate establishment does not appear to shepherdesses and so forth,] it [absurdly] follows that shepherdesses and so forth have already been released because [according to you] not any phenomena appear to those [shepherdesses and above] as truly established. You have asserted the three spheres [of self-contradiction].

[ལུང་དེའི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཅེས་པ་ཡན་ཆད་ཀྱིས་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་གྲུབ་པ་ནི་བ་ལང་རྫི་ཡན་ཆད་ཀྱི་བློ་ལ་སྣང་བ་འདི་ཁོ་ན་ཡིན་ལ། ཞེས་བཤད་པ་དང་། (གཞན་ནི་ཅིག་ཤོས་སོ་ཞེས་པའི་)ལྷག་མས་ནི་དོན་དམ་དུ་གྲུབ་ཚད་བ་ལང་རྫི་སོགས་ལ་མི་སྣང་བར་བསྟན་པ་]འདོད་ན། བ་ལང་རྫི་སོགས་གྲོལ་ཟིན་པར་ཐལ། དེ་དག་ལ་ཆོས་གང་ཡང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་མི་སྣང་བའི་ཕྱིར། འཁོར་གསུམ།

Also, it [absurdly] follows that those [shepherdesses and so forth] have already found the view of the Middle because all phenomena appear to those [shepherdesses and so forth] as established in conventional terms. You have asserted the three spheres [of self-contradiction].

[188b]གཞན་ཡང་[བ་ལང་རྫི་སོགས་]དེ་དག་གིས་དབུ་མའི་ལྟ་བ་རྙེད་ཟིན་པར་ཐལ། [བ་ལང་རྫི་སོགས་]དེ་དག་ལ་ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་གྲུབ་པར་སྣང་བའི་ཕྱིར། འཁོར་གསུམ།

Also, it [absurdly] follows that that passage [in Jñānagarbha's *Differentiation of the Two Truths*] is not a passage identifying obscurational/conventional truths and ultimate truths because [according to you] that passage is to be associated with the two measures of establishment [that is, the measure of conventional establishment and the measure of ultimate establishment]. You have accepted the reason [which is that that passage is to be associated with the two measures of establishment, that is, the measure of conventional establishment and the measure of ultimate establishment].

གཞན་ཡང་གཞུང་དེ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་བདེན་པ་དང་དོན་དམ་བདེན་པ་ངོས་འཛིན་གྱི་གཞུང་མ་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། [གཞུང་དེ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་དང་དོན་དམ་]དེ་གྲུབ་ཚད་གཉིས་ལ་སྦྱར་བའི་ཕྱིར། [གཞུང་དེ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་དང་

དོན་དམ་དེ་གྲུབ་ཚད་གཉིས་ལ་སྦྱར་བ་]རྟགས་ཁས།

If [that passage is to be associated with the two measures of establishment, that is, the measure of conventional establishment and the measure of ultimate establishment,] does not entail [that that passage in Jñānagarbha's *Differentiation of the Two Truths* is not a passage identifying conventional truths and ultimate truths], it very absurdly follows that whatever is established as being an ultimate truth must be truly established! You cannot accept the root [consequence that that passage [in Jñānagarbha's *Differentiation of the Two Truths*] is not a passage identifying obscurational/conventional truths and ultimate truths] because [Jñānagarbha]:

1. indicates the purpose with one stanza:[a]

> Those who know the differentiation of the two truths
> [Are not obscured with regard to the Sage's teaching.
> Having entirely accumulated the collections (of merit and wisdom),
> They will just go to the marvelous other side.]

2. and then indicates the mode of teaching with:

> The Sage spoke of the conventional and the ultimate
> As the two truths.

3. and then indicates the identification of the two truths with:

> Only these in accordance with how they appear
> Are conventional; the others are the counterpart.

[གཞུང་དེ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་དང་དོན་དམ་དེ་གྲུབ་ཚད་གཉིས་ལ་སྦྱར་ན་གཞུང་དེ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་བདེན་པ་དང་དོན་དམ་བདེན་པ་ངོས་འཛིན་གྱི་གཞུང་མ་ཡིན་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ་ན། དོན་དམ་བདེན་པ་ཡིན་པར་གྲུབ་ན་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཡིན་དགོས་པར་ཐལ་ལོ། །[གཞུང་དེ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་བདེན་པ་དང་དོན་དམ་བདེན་པ་ངོས་འཛིན་གྱི་གཞུང་མ་ཡིན་པར་]རྩ་བར་འདོད་མི་ནུས་ཏེ། དེ་ཉིད་ལས། བདེན་གཉིས་རྣམ་དབྱེ་ཤེས་པ་དག །ཅེས་སོགས་ཚིགས་བཅད་གཅིག་

[a] Jñānagarbha, *bden pa gnyis rnam par 'byed pa'i tshig le'u byas pa* (*satyadvaya-vibhaṅgakārika*), in *bstan 'gyur* (*sde dge*), TBRC W23703, 107 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 1a.2-1a.3.

གིས་དགོས་པ་བསྟན། དེ་ནས་དེ་ཉིད་ལས། ཀུན་རྫོབ་དང་ནི་དམ་པའི་དོན། །བདེན་པ་གཉིས་སུ་ཐུབ་པས་གསུངས། །ཞེས་པས་གསུངས་ཚུལ་བསྟན། དེ་ནས། ཇི་ལྟར་སྣང་བ་འདི་ཁོ་ན། །ཀུན་རྫོབ་གཞན་ནི་ཅིག་ཤོས་ཡིན།[a] །ཞེས་པས་བདེན་གཉིས་ཀྱི་ངོས་འཛིན་བསྟན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The first reason [which is that Jñānagarbha indicates the purpose with one stanza:

> Those who know the differentiation of the two truths
> Are not obscured with regard to the Sage's teaching.
> Having entirely accumulated the collections [of merit and wisdom],
> They will just go to the marvelous other side.]

is easy [to establish.] The second reason [which is that Jñānagarbha indicates the mode of teaching with:[b]

> The Sage spoke of the conventional and the ultimate
> As the two truths]

is established because Jñānagarbha's *Auto-commentary* says:[c]

> [With respect to the statement in the root text "The Sage spoke of the conventional and the ultimate as the two truths,"] "here and there in Buddhist scriptures" is an extra phrase [that is to be added to that statement.]

and Shāntarakṣhita's *Commentarial Explanation of (Jñānagarbha's) "Differentiation of the Two Truths"* says:[d]

> Through the general term "here and there" [Jñānagarbha] indicates that [the teaching of two truths occurs] in many sūtras.

[a] Ibid., 1a.5-1a.6.

[b] Ibid., 1a.3-1a.4.

[c] Ibid., 4a.2.

[d] This passage is not from Jñānagarbha's autocommentary, but from Shāntarakṣhita's *Commentary on the Difficult Points in (Jñānagarbha's) "Differentiation of the Two Truths."* See Śāntarakṣita, *bden pa gnyis rnam par 'byed pa'i dka' 'grel* (*satyadvaya-vibhaṅga-pañjikā*), in *bstan 'gyur* (*sde dge*), TBRC W23703.107 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 17b.3.

[དེ་ཉིད་ལས། བདེན་གཉིས་རྣམ་དབྱེ་ཤེས་པ་དག །ཅེས་སོགས་ཚིགས་བཅད་གཅིག་གིས་དགོས་པ་བསྟན་པའི་རྟགས་]དང་པོ་སླ། [དེ་ནས་དེ་ཉིད་ལས། ཀུན་རྫོབ་དང་ནི་དམ་པའི་དོན། །བདེན་པ་གཉིས་སུ་ཐུབ་པས་གསུངས། །ཞེས་པས་གསུངས་ཚུལ་བསྟན་པའི་]རྟགས་གཉིས་པ་གྲུབ་སྟེ། བདེན་གཉིས་རང་འགྲེལ་ལས། [ཀུན་རྫོབ་དང་ནི་དམ་པའི་དོན། བདེན་གཉིས་ཐུབ་པས་གསུངས་པ་ལ།] མདོ་སྡེ་དེ་དང་དེར་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ནི་ཚིག་གི་ལྷག་མའོ། །ཞེས་དང་། དེའི་འགྲེལ་བཤད་ལས། དེ་དང་དེར་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ནི་སྦྱོར་བཏང་བའི་ཚིག་གིས་མདོ་སྡེ་མང་བ་ཉིད་དུ་སྟོན་ཏོ་ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The third [reason which is that Jñānagarbha indicates the identification of the two truths with:

> Only these in accordance with how they appear
> Are conventional; the others are the counterpart.]

is established because Shāntarakṣhita's *Commentarial Explanation of (Jñānagarbha's) "Differentiation of the Two Truths"* says:[a]

> With respect to teaching the meaning of the differentiation of the two truths, the teaching "Only these appearances to awarenesses" is for the sake of indicating that "[These appearances] are not in exact accordance with reasoning [Jñānagarbha's] statement of "Conventionalities" means conventional truths (*kun rdzob bden pa*) because a final term [that is, *bden pa*] is drawn forth from within it [that is, *kun rdzob*]. "Others" are other than the mode of appearance. Therefore, this indicates "exact accordance with reasoning, ultimate truth."

and Jñānagarbha's *Auto-commentary* also says:[b]

> Only these in accordance with how they appear
> Are conventional; the others are the counterpart.

> ["The others" (relative to conventional truths)] is the equivalent of saying ultimate truth. Whatever shepherdesses and above see

[a] Ibid., 17b.3-17b.4.
[b] Jñānagarbha, *bden gnyis rnam 'byed pa'i 'grel pa,* 4a.2-4a.4.

abide as true conventionally in that way, but not really.

That is very easy to realize.

[ཇི་ལྟར་སྣང་བ་འདི་ཁོ་ན། །ཀུན་རྫོབ་གཞན་ནི་ཅིག་ཤོས་ཡིན། །ཞེས་པས་བདེན་གཉིས་ཀྱི་ངོས་འཛིན་བསྟན་པའི་རྟགས་]གསུམ་པ་གྲུབ་སྟེ། བདེན་གཉིས་འགྲེལ་བཤད་ལས། བདེན་པ་གཉིས་རྣམ་པར་དབྱེ་བའི་དོན་ཡང་བྱའོ། །ཞེས་སྨོན་པ་[ལ་]ཇི་ལྟར་སྣང་བ་འདི་ཁོ་ན་ཞེས་པ་བསྟན་པ་ནི་རིགས་པ་ཇི་ལྟ་[སྣང་]བ་བཞིན་དུ་མ་ཡིན་ནོ། །ཞེས་བསྟན་པའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །ཀུན་རྫོབ་སྨོས་པ་ནི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཀྱི་བདེན་པ་སྟེ་ཚིག་ཐ་མ་ཁོང་[189a]ནས་དབྱུང་བའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །གཞན་ནི་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ནི་ཇི་ལྟར་སྣང་བ་ལས་གཞན་པའོ། ། དེའི་ཕྱིར་འདི་ནི་རིགས་པ་ཇི་ལྟ་བ་བཞིན་ཉིད་ནི་དོན་དམ་པའི་བདེན་པའོ་ཞེས་སྨོན་ཏོ། །ཞེས་དང་། བདེན་གཉིས་རང་འགྲེལ་ལས་ཀྱང་། ཇི་ལྟར་སྣང་བ་འདི་ཁོ་ན། །ཀུན་རྫོབ་གཞན་ནི་ཅིག་ཤོས་ཡིན། །དོན་དམ་པའི་བདེན་པ་ཞེས་བྱ་བའི་ཐ་ཚིག་གོ །ཇི་ལྟར་བ་ལང་རྫི་མོ་ལ་སོགས་པ་ཡན་ཆད་ཀྱིས་མཐོང་བ་དེ་ལྟར་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་བདེན་པ་རྣམ་པར་གནས་ཀྱི་[ཡང་དག་པར་ནི་མ་ཡིན་ཏེ་]ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར། ཤིན་ཏུ་རྟོགས་སླ།

5. Also, someone says: With respect to forms and so forth, whatever is the true establishment that is the object of negation in “ultimately not existing” appears to sense consciousnesses.

ཡང་ཁ་ཅིག་ན་རེ། གཟུགས་སོགས་སྟེང་གི་དོན་དམ་པར་མེད་ཅེས་པའི་དགག་བྱ་བདེན་[258]པ་གང་ཡིན་དབང་ཤེས་ལ་སྣང་ཟེར་ན།

Our response: Well, it [absurdly] follows that even the ultimate production of forms and so forth in the face of a rational consciousness appears to sense consciousnesses because [according to you] the production of forms and so forth in terms of both ultimates [as apprehended by an artificial apprehension of true existence and by an innate apprehension of true existence] appears to sense consciousnesses.

འོ་ན་གཟུགས་སོགས་རིགས་ཤེས་ངོར་དོན་དམ་པར་སྐྱེ་བ་ཡང་དབང་ཤེས་ལ་སྣང་བར་ཐལ། གཟུགས་སོགས་ཀྱི་དོན་དམ་པ་གཉིས་ཀའི་སྐྱེ་བ་དབང་ཤེས་ལ་སྣང་བའི་ཕྱིར།

It [absurdly] follows that [the production of forms and so forth in terms of both ultimates (as apprehended by an artificial apprehension of true existence and by an innate apprehension of true existence) appears to sense consciousnesses] because [according to you] your thesis [that with respect to forms and so forth, whatever is the true establishment that is the object of negation in "ultimately not existing" appears to sense consciousnesses] is logically feasible. [However,] you cannot assert [that the production of forms and so forth in terms of both ultimates (as apprehended by an artificial apprehension of true existence and by an innate apprehension of true existence) appears to sense consciousnesses] because the distinction is explained that the five forms and so forth and the five true establishments of those five appear to the individual sense consciousnesses but the five real productions of those [five forms and so forth] and the five productions of true establishment in the face of a rational consciousness do not [appear to the five sense consciousnesses], because Jñānagarbha's *Auto-commentary on the "Differentiation of Two Truths"* says, "Real production and so forth do not appear, when things appear," and Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation* says:

> Jñānagarbha's *Autocommentary on "Differentiation of the Two Truths"* explains that true [existence] that is the object of negation does not appear to sense consciousnesses, and it is the same here [in Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle*].

[གཟུགས་སོགས་ཀྱི་དོན་དམ་པ་གཉིས་ཀའི་སྐྱེ་བ་དབང་ཤེས་ལ་སྣང་བ་]དེར་ཐལ། ཁྱོད་ཀྱི་དམ་བཅའ་[གཟུགས་སོགས་སྟེང་གི་དོན་དམ་པར་མེད་ཅེས་པའི་དགག་བྱ་བདེན་པ་གང་ཡིན་དབང་ཤེས་ལ་སྣང་བ་]འཐད་པའི་ཕྱིར། [གཟུགས་སོགས་ཀྱི་དོན་དམ་པ་གཉིས་ཀའི་སྐྱེ་བ་དབང་ཤེས་ལ་སྣང་བ་]འདོད་མི་ནུས་ཏེ།

གཟུགས་སོགས་ལྷ་དང་[གཟུགས་སོགས་]དེ་ལྷ་བདེན་གྲུབ་ལྷ་དབང་ཤེས་སོ་སོ་ལ་སྣང་ལ། [གཟུགས་སོགས་ལྷ་]དེ་དག་ཡང་དག་པའི་སྐྱེ་བ་ལྷ་དང་རིགས་ངོའི་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་སྐྱེ་བ་ལྷ་[དབང་ཤེས་ལ་སྣང་བ་]མེད་པའི་ཁྱད་པར་བཤད་པའི་ཕྱིར། བདེན་གཉིས་རང་འགྲེལ་ལས། ཡང་དག་པའི་སྐྱེ་སོགས་དངོས་པོ་སྣང་བ་ན་མི་སྣང་བས། ཞེས་དང་། རྣམ་བཤད་ལས། མཐོང་བ་ནི་རྟོག་པ་ཡིན་གྱི་དབང་ཤེས་མ་ཡིན་ཏེ། བདེན་གཉིས་འགྲེལ་པར་དགག་བྱ་བདེན་པ་དབང་ཤེས་[189b]ལ་མི་སྣང་བར་བཤད་པ་འདིར་ཡང་འདྲ་བའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

This [true existence that is the object of negation] is done in terms of true establishment in the face of a rational [consciousness] because in the case of negating true establishment in the texts of the Autonomy School, production and so forth that is truly established in the face of a rational [consciousness] is negated,

[དགག་བྱ་བདེན་པ་]འདི་རིགས་ངོའི་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་དབང་དུ་བྱས་པ་ཡིན་ཏེ། རང་རྒྱུད་པའི་གཞུང་རྣམས་ལས་བདེན་གྲུབ་འགོག་སྐབས་རིགས་ངོའི་བདེན་སྐྱེས་སོགས་བཀག་པ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར་ཏེ།

because Tsong-kha-pa's *The Essence of Eloquence* says:[a]

> Concerning this, in commentary on the statement that earth and so forth are not ultimately entities of the elements Bhāvaviveka's *Blaze of Reasoning* says:
>
> > With respect to *artha* [in the compound *paramārtha*] because of being an object of knowledge [or something that

[a] Translation by Jeffrey Hopkins, *Emptiness in the Autonomy School of Buddhism,* unpublished manuscript, 53. The material at the beginning of this citation from Tsong-kha-pa's *The Essence of Eloquence* quoting Bhāvaviveka's *Blaze of Reasoning* is added to Jam-yang-shay-pa's citation for context; it is from Tsong-kha-pa, *drang nges legs bshad snying po* (sku 'bum: Sku 'bum Byams pa gling Par khang, 2000?), 64b.6-65a.2. The ellipsis in Jam-yang-shay-pa's own citation has been filled in from the same, 65a.2-65a.5.

> is known], it is an object (*artha*)—this being synonymous with "object of analysis" and "object to be understood." *Parama* (highest) is a term for "supreme." With respect to the compound *paramārtha* (highest object), because of being an object and also being highest, it is the highest object (*paramārtha*).
>
> Or, in another way, [*paramārtha* means] the object of the highest (*paramasya artha*). Because of being the object of the highest non-conceptual pristine wisdom, it is the object of the highest (*paramārtha*).
>
> Or, in another way, [*paramārtha* means] that which is concordant with the ultimate. Since the wisdom concordant with [direct] realization of the highest object [that is, the ultimate, emptiness,] has that highest object, it is concordant with the highest object [that is to say, the highest wisdom].

From among these three that [Bhāvaviveka] mentions, the last is the meaning on this occasion [of refuting that the elements, for instance, do not ultimately exist, that is to say, that the elements do not exist for an ultimate rational consciousness or, more strictly, are not established as able to bear analysis by an ultimate rational consciousness].

ལེགས་བཤད་སྙིང་པོ་ལས། [དོན་དམ་པ་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ནི་དེ་དོན་ཡང་ཡིན་ལ་དམ་པ་ཡང་ཡིན་པས་དོན་དམ་པའོ། །ཡང་ན་དམ་པའི་དོན་ཏེ་རྣམ་པར་མི་རྟོག་པའི་ཡེ་ཤེས་དམ་པའི་དོན་ཡིན་པས་དམ་པའི་དོན་ཏོ། །ཡང་ན་དོན་དམ་པ་དང་མཐུན་པ་སྟེ་དོན་དམ་པ་རྟོགས་པ་དང་རྗེས་སུ་མཐུན་པའི་ཤེས་རབ་ལ་དོན་དམ་པ་དེ་ཡོད་པས་དོན་དམ་པ་དང་མཐུན་པའོ་ཞེས་]གསུམ་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱི་མ་ནི་སྐབས་ཀྱི་དོན་ཡིན་ཏེ།

Bhāvaviveka's *Blaze of Reasoning* says:

> The ultimate [that is to say, the highest consciousness] is of two types. One is the uncontaminated supramundane [consciousness] that operates without [conceptual] activity and is without the proliferations [of dualism]. The second is called "mundane pristine wisdom (*ye shes*)" which operates together with [conceptual] activity, is a concordant [result] of the collections of merit and wisdom, and

> involves the proliferations [of dualism]. Here, that [latter type] is held as the qualification [“ultimately”] in the thesis [that earth and so forth **ultimately** do not exist as entities of the elements].

A rational consciousness analyzing the ultimate also must be asserted as that [ultimate in “ultimately does not exist”]; it is not just a Superior’s rational consciousness attained subsequent to meditative equipoise. In that case, the meaning of the statement that a basis—that Proponents of the Middle Way and others analyze whether it ultimately exists or not—“does not exist ultimately” is that it does not exist in the perspective of a rational consciousness analyzing the ultimate with respect to that base; [it means that] it is not established by that [rational consciousness].

Anything clearer than that [identification of the object of negation in Bhāvaviveka’s *Blaze of Reasoning*] is not set forth in the scope[a] of the texts by this master [Bhāvaviveka]. Also, a *clear* identification does not appear in the scope of the master Jñānagarbha’s *[Differentiation of] the Two Truths* and Shāntarakṣhita’s *Ornament for the Middle* as well as his own commentary.

རྟོག་གེ་འབར་བས་དོན་དམ་པ་རྣམ་པ་གཉིས་ཏེ། ཞེས་པ་ནས། [དེ་ལ་གཅིག་ནི་མངོན་པར་འདུ་བྱེད་པ་མེད་པར་འཇུག་པའི་འཇིག་རྟེན་ལས་འདས་པ་ཟག་པ་མེད་པ་སྤྲོས་པ་མེད་པའོ། །གཉིས་པ་ནི། མངོན་པར་འདུ་བྱེད་པ་དང་བཅས་པར་འཇུག་པ་བསོད་ནམས་དང་ཡེ་ཤེས་ཀྱི་ཚོགས་ཀྱི་རྗེས་སུ་མཐུན་པ་དག་པ་འཇིག་རྟེན་པའི་ཡེ་ཤེས་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་སྤྲོས་པ་དང་བཅས་པ་སྟེ། འདིར་དེ་དམ་བཅས་པའི་ཁྱད་པར་ཉིད་དུ་བཟུང་བས་ཉེས་པ་མེད་དོ་ཞེས་གསུངས་ཏེ། དོན་དམ་དཔྱོད་པའི་རིགས་ཤེས་ཀྱང་དེར་འདོད་དགོས་ཀྱི་འཕགས་པའི་རྗེས་ཐོབ་ཀྱི་རིགས་ཤེས་ཁོ་ན་མིན་ནོ།] དེ་ལྟར་ན་དབུ་མ་པ་དང་གཞན་དག་དོན་དམ་ཡོད་མེད་དཔྱོད་པའི་གཞི་དེ་དོན་དམ་པར་མེད་ཅེས་པའི་དོན་ནི་གཞི་དེ་དོན་དམ་དཔྱོད་པའི་རིགས་ངོར་མེད་པ་སྟེ། དེས་མ་གྲུབ་ཅེས་པའི་སློབ་དཔོན་འདིའི་གཞུང་གི་སྐོར་ནས་དེ་ལས་གསལ་བ་མ་བཤད་

[a] “Scope” (*skor*) includes Jñānagarbha’s own commentary.

ལ་སློབ་དཔོན་ཡེ་ཤེས་སྙིང་པོའི་བདེན་གཉིས་ཀྱི་སྐོར་དང་དབུ་མ་རྒྱན་རང་འགྲེལ་དང་བཅས་པ་ལས་ཀྱང་གསལ་བར་ངོས་བཟུང་བ་མི་སྣང་ངོ༑ ༑ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར༑

Such an object of negation does not appear to sense consciousnesses because an ultimate established by that [rational consciousness would be] treated as the mode of subsistence.

འདི་འདྲའི་དགག་བྱ་དབང་ཤེས་ལ་མི་སྣང་ཏེ་དེས་གྲུབ་པའི་དོན་དམ་དེ་གནས་ལུགས་ལ་བྱེད་པའི་ཕྱིར་རོ༑ ༑

6. Also, someone says: Even the Autonomists assert that all phenomena are merely imputed by conceptuality.

ཡང་ཁ་ཅིག རང་རྒྱུད་པས་ཀྱང་ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་རྟོག་པས་བཏགས་ཙམ་དུ་འདོད་ཟེར་ན༑

Our response: That [even the Autonomists assert that all phenomena are merely imputed by conceptuality] is not logically feasible because:

(1) these [Autonomists] assert that all phenomena, within not being merely imputed by conceptuality, are established from their own side;

(2) also they assert that although [all phenomena] are posited by the power of appearing to awareness, there is no contradiction that [all phenomena] are not merely imputed by terms and conceptual consciousnesses (*sgra rtog*);

(3) also they assert that all phenomena, within not being merely imputed by names, are found through being sought [by analysis];

(4) also they do not accept that cause, effect, and so forth are existent in the sense of being posited by the power of nominal conventions.

[རང་རྒྱུད་པས་ཀྱང་ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་རྟོག་པས་བཏགས་ཙམ་དུ་འདོད་པ་]དེ་མི་འཐད་པར་ཐལ༑ འདི་པས་ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་རྟོག་པས་བཏགས་ཙམ་མ་ཡིན་པར་རང་ངོས་ནས་གྲུབ་པར་ཡང་འདོད་པ་གང་ཞིག ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་བློ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡིན་ཀྱང་

བློ་རྟོག་གིས་བཏགས་ཙམ་མ་ཡིན་པ་མི་འགལ་བར་ཡང་འདོད། ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་མིང་གིས་བཏགས་ཙམ་མ་[190a]ཡིན་པར་བཙལ་[259]བས་རྙེད་པར་ཡང་འདོད། རྒྱུ་འབྲས་སོགས་མིང་གི་ཐ་སྙད་ཀྱི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པའི་ཡོད་པར་ཡང་ཁས་མི་ལེན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The first reason [which is that these Autonomists assert that all phenomena, within not being imputed by conceptuality, are established from their own side] is established because Tsong-kha-pa's *Answers to Questions by Jang-chub Lama*[a] says:

> Since Middle Autonomists assert objects that are established by way of their own character even in conventional terms (*tha snyad du*), the meaning of not being merely imputed by conceptuality is complete even in their system's [assertion of] illusion empty of true existence.

[འདི་པས་ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་རྟོག་པས་བཏགས་ཙམ་མ་ཡིན་པར་རང་ངོས་ནས་གྲུབ་པར་ཡང་འདོད་པའི་]རྟགས་དང་པོ་གྲུབ་སྟེ། བྱང་ཆུབ་བླ་མའི་དྲིས་ལན་ལས། དབུ་མ་རང་རྒྱུད་པ་རྣམས་ཀྱིས་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་ཡང་རང་གི་མཚན་ཉིད་ཀྱིས་གྲུབ་པའི་དོན་བཞེད་པས་འདི་པའི་ལུགས་ཀྱི་བདེན་སྟོང་སྒྱུ་མ་ལའང་རྟོག་པས་བཏགས་ཙམ་མ་ཡིན་པའི་དོན་ཚང་ངོ་། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The second reason [which is that they assert that although all phenomena are merely posited by the power of appearing to awareness, there is no contradiction that all phenomena are not merely imputed by terms and

[a] Ge-she Jang-chub-la-ma (*dge bshes byang chub bla ma*) was an abbot of Tshal-ü-ling (*tshal dbus gling,* the Mantra College) at Gung-thang monastery in the Gung-thang area close to Lhasa during Tsong-kha-pa's time. See Per K. Sørensen and Guntram Hazod, *Rulers on the Celestial Plain: Ecclesiastic and Secular Hegemony in Medieval Tibet: a Study of Tshal Gung-thang,* vol. 1, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Denkschriften (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007), 234, n. 657.

conceptual consciousnesses] is established because Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation [of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'"]* says:[a]

> In that way, in this system even though there is no mode of subsistence not posited by the force of appearing to an awareness, it is not contradictory for there to be a mode of subsistence that is posited by the force of appearing to an awareness but is not merely nominally imputed [whereas such is contradictory in the Consequence School].

[ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་བློ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡིན་ཀྱང་སྒྲ་རྟོག་གིས་བཏགས་ཙམ་མ་ཡིན་པ་མི་འགལ་བར་ཡང་འདོད་པའི་རྟགས་]གཉིས་པ་གྲུབ་སྟེ། རྣམ་བཤད་ལས། དེ་ལྟར་བློ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་མ་ཡིན་པའི་སྡོད་ལུགས་མེད་ཀྱང་། དེའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པའི་སྡོད་ལུགས་མིང་དུ་བཏགས་པ་ཙམ་མ་ཡིན་པ་གཅིག་ཡོད་པ་ལུགས་འདི་ལ་མི་འགལ་བས། ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The third reason [which is that they assert that all phenomena, within not being merely imputed by names, are found through being sought] is established because Tsong-kha-pa's *Ocean of Reasoning* says:

> Because Autonomists assert that the mere mode of analysis above is not an analysis of [an object's] being established as [its own] suchness, they also assert that objects sought in that way exist.

[ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་མིང་གིས་བཏགས་ཙམ་མ་ཡིན་པར་བཙལ་བས་རྙེད་པར་ཡང་འདོད་པའི་རྟགས་]གསུམ་པ་གྲུབ་སྟེ། རིགས་པའི་རྒྱ་མཚོ་ལས། རང་རྒྱུད་པ་རྣམས་ནི་ཕྱར་ལྟར་དཔྱོད་པ་དེ་ཙམ་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་དུ་གྲུབ་པ་དཔྱོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་པར་འདོད་པས་དེ་འདྲས་བཙལ་བའི་དོན་ཡོད་པར་ཡང་འདོད་ལ་ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The fourth reason [which is that they do not accept that cause, effect, and so forth are existent in the sense of being posited by the power of nominal

---

[a] Adapted from Hopkins, *Tsong-kha-pa's Final Exposition of Wisdom,* 200.

conventions] is established because [Tsong-kha-pa] says in the same text:

> Cause, effect, and so forth are not asserted as being existent in the sense of being posited by the power of nominal conventions.

[རྒྱུ་འབྲས་སོགས་མིང་གི་ཐ་སྙད་ཀྱི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པའི་ཡོད་པར་ཡང་ཁས་མི་ལེན་པའི་རྟགས་]བཞི་པ་གྲུབ་སྟེ། དེ་ཉིད་ལས། རྒྱུ་འབྲས་ལ་སོགས་པ་རྣམས་མིང་གི་ཐ་སྙད་ཀྱི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པའི་ཡོད་པར་མི་འདོད་པས། ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

7. ***With regard to that, someone says:*** It follows that [Autonomists] do not assert that the term "only" (*tsam*) in "only imputed by names" (*ming gis btags tsam*) eliminates the two, "own-character" and "establishment from its own side" because even the Proponents of Mind-Only School assert that the term "only" [in "only imputed by names"] does not eliminate "establishment from its own side."

བྱས་པ་ལ་ཁོ་ན་རེ། འདི་པས་མིང་གིས་བཏགས་ཙམ་གྱི་ཙམ་སྒྲས་རང་མཚན་དང་རང་ངོས་ནས་གྲུབ་པ་གཉིས་གཅོད་པར་མི་བཞེད་པར་ཐལ། སེམས་ཙམ་པས་ཀྱང་ཙམ་སྒྲས་རང་ངོས་ནས་གྲུབ་པ་མི་གཅོད་པར་འདོད་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: [That even the Proponents of Mind-Only assert that the term "only" does not eliminate "establishment from its own side"] does not entail [that Autonomists do not assert that the term "only (*tsam*)" in "only imputed by names" (*ming gis btags tsam*) eliminates the two, "own-character" and "establishment from its own side,"] and you cannot accept [that Autonomists do not assert that the term "only" (*tsam*) in "only imputed by names" (*ming gis btags tsam*) eliminates the two, "own-character" and "establishment from its own side"] because having negated the mode of assertion of the Mind-Only School, Bhāvaviveka indicates (1) that imputation as truly established is the entity of character that is nonexistent and (2) that being only posited by names and terminology as truly established is the meaning of imputational [natures] being posited by names and terminology.

[190b][སེམས་ཙམ་པས་ཀྱང་ཙམ་སྒྲས་རང་ངོས་ནས་གྲུབ་པ་མི་གཅོད་པར་འདོད་ན་

འདི་པས་མིང་གིས་བཏགས་ཙམ་གྱི་ཙམ་སྣྲས་རང་མཚན་དང་རང་ངོས་ནས་གྲུབ་པ་གཉིས་གཅོད་པར་མི་བཞེད་པ་ཡིན་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ་ཅེར་། [མིང་གིས་བཏགས་ཙམ་གྱི་ཙམ་སྣྲས་རང་མཚན་དང་རང་ངོས་ནས་གྲུབ་པ་གཉིས་གཅོད་པར་མི་བཞེད་པ་ཡིན་པར་]འདོད་མི་ནུས་ཏེ། སེམས་ཙམ་པའི་འདོད་ཚུལ་ལ་ལེགས་ལྡན་གྱིས་དགག་པ་མཛད་ནས་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་ཀུན་བཏགས་པ་མཚན་ཉིད་ཀྱི་ངོ་བོ་མེད་རྒྱུ་དང་། བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་མིང་བརྡས་བཞག་ཙམ་དེ་ཀུན་བཏགས་མིང་བརྡས་བཞག་པའི་དོན་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

It follows [having refuted the mode of assertion of the Mind-Only School, Bhāvaviveka indicates (1) that imputation as truly established is the entity of character that is nonexistent and (2) that being only posited by names and terminology as truly established is the meaning of imputational [natures] being posited by names and terminology] because, as explained in the section on Bhāvaviveka's assertions, Tsong-kha-pa's *The Essence of Eloquence* says:[a]

> At that time [that is, therefore,] the imputational natures—about which [the *Sūtra Unraveling the Thought*] says "imputational natures are character-non-natures"—are the conceived objects [such as form and the production of form] thoroughly imputed to be ultimate[ly existent]. That [the *Sūtra Unraveling the Thought*] says that these are posited by name and terminology means that [these nonexistent imputational natures] are exhausted as only imputed by terms and conceptual consciousnesses.

[སེམས་ཙམ་པའི་འདོད་ཚུལ་ལ་ལེགས་ལྡན་གྱིས་དགག་པ་མཛད་ནས་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་ཀུན་བཏགས་པ་མཚན་ཉིད་ཀྱི་ངོ་བོ་མེད་རྒྱུ་དང་། བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་མིང་བརྡས་བཞག་ཙམ་དེ་ཀུན་བཏགས་མིང་བརྡས་བཞག་པའི་དོན་ཡིན་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། ལེགས་ལྡན་གྱི་འདོད་ཚུལ་སྐབས་ཀྱི་ལེགས་བཤད་སྙིང་པོ་ལས། དེའི་ཚེ་ཀུན་བཏགས་ལ་མཚན་ཉིད་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་མེད་དོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་

---

[a] Hopkins, *Maps of the Profound,* 711; Tsong-kha-pa, *legs bshad snying po,* 56a.

པའི་ཀུན་བཏགས་ནི་ཞེན་ཡུལ་དེར་དོན་དམ་པར་ཀུན་བཏགས་པ་ཡིན་ལ། དེ་མིང་དང་བརྡས་བཞག་པར་གསུངས་པ་ནི། སྒྲ་རྟོག་གིས་བཏགས་པ་ཙམ་དུ་ཟད་པའི་དོན་ནོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

Shāntarakṣhita and his spiritual son [Kamalashīla] also assert like what Tsong-kha-pa said. [Kamalashīla's] *Illumination of the Middle* says:[a]

> With regard to other-powered natures (*gzhan gyi dbang gi ngo bo nyid*) which are not different from illusions and so forth, whatsoever superimpositions of permanence, impermanence, and so forth as ultimate entities are imputational natures. Also because these [other-powered natures] are not established in accordance with the imputational character, [imputational natures] are posited as character-non-natures.

རྗེ་རིན་པོ་ཆེས་གསུངས་པ་འདི་ལྟར་ཞི་འཚོ་ཡབ་སྲས་ཀྱང་བཞེད་དེ། དབུ་མ་སྣང་བ་ལས། གཞན་གྱི་དབང་གི་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་སྒྱུ་མ་ལ་[260]སོགས་པ་དང་ཁྱད་པར་མེད་པ་དེ་ཉིད་ལ་རྟག་པ་མི་རྟག་པ་ལ་སོགས་པ་དོན་དམ་པའི་རང་གི་ངོ་བོར་སྒྲོ་འདོགས་པ་གང་ཡིན་པ་དེ་ནི་ཀུན་བཏགས་པའི་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་དོ། །དེ་ཡང་ཇི་ལྟར་ཀུན་བཏགས་པའི་མཚན་ཉིད་དུ་མ་གྲུབ་པའི་ཕྱིར། མཚན་ཉིད་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་མེད་པ་ཉིད་དུ་རྣམ་པར་བཞག་གོ །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

8. With regard to that, someone says: It follows that [in the system of the Autonomists] there are phenomena only imputed by names because forms and so forth are [phenomena only imputed by names] because:

[a] Kamalashīla, *dbu ma snang ba* (*madhyamakāloka*), in *bstan 'gyur* (*sde dge*), TBRC W23703.107 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 151a.2-151a.3.

- Haribhadra's *Clear Meaning Commentary* says:[a]

> All phenomena ranging from forms to Buddhas are conventional phenomena (*chos tha snyad pa*) that are terminologically imputed.

- and Mother Sūtras [Perfection of Wisdom Sūtras] say:

> Forms are adventitiously imputed by names…exalted-knowers-of-all-aspects are adventitiously imputed by names.

- and Haribhadra's *Great Commentary* (*'grel chen*) says:

> All these phenomena are only names,
> From [their] mere appearance they do not have inherent existence.

བྱས་པ་ལ་ཁོ་ན་རེ། [རང་རྒྱུད་པའི་ལུགས་ལ་]མིང་གིས་བཏགས་ཙམ་གྱི་ཆོས་ཡོད་པར་ཐལ། གཟུགས་སོགས་[ནི་མིང་གིས་བཏགས་ཙམ་གྱི་ཆོས་]དེ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར་ཏེ། འགྲེལ་པ་དོན་གསལ་ལས། གཟུགས་ནས་སངས་རྒྱས་ཞེས་བྱ་བའི་བར་གྱི་ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་བརྡར་བཏགས་པའི་ཆོས་ཐ་སྙད་པ་ཡིན་ནོ། །ཞེས་དང་། ཡུམ་གྱི་[191a]མདོ་ལས། གཟུགས་ནི་གློ་བུར་དུ་མིང་གིས་བཏགས་པའོ། །ནས། རྣམ་པ་ཐམས་ཅད་མཁྱེན་པ་ཉིད་ནི་གློ་བུར་དུ་མིང་གིས་བཏགས་པའོ། །ཞེས་དང་། འགྲེལ་ཆེན་ལས། འདི་དག་ཐམས་ཅད་མིང་ཙམ་སྟེ། །སྣང་ཙམ་ཉིད་ནས་རང་བཞིན་མེད། །ཅེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: [The above statements] do not entail [that forms and so forth are phenomena only imputed by names] because:

---

[a] Haribhadra, *shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyan ces bya ba'i 'grel pa* (*abhisamayālaṃkāra-nāma-prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstra-vṛtti*), in *bstan 'gyur* (*sde dge*). TBRC W23703.86 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 87a.1-87a.2. mdo 'grel, ja, 87a.1-2.

(1) the first scriptural passage [Haribhadra's *Clear Meaning Commentary*] explains that phenomena are imputed with conventions by terminology, but does not explain that [phenomena] are only imputed with conventions

(2) and the meaning of the sūtra passage is that "Forms and so forth are adventitiously only imputed by names *as truly established*" because it is necessary to explain that since [forms and so forth] from the first are not truly established, [the imputation of true establishment] is adventitious, and [forms and so forth] are only posited by names and terminology as truly established, since Āryavimuktasena's *Ascertainment of the "Twenty-Five Thousand Stanza Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra"* says:

> That from the very first [forms and so forth] are natureless [means that they are] adventitiously arisen. Terminological imputation is nominal imputation.

[འདི་འདྲ་གསུངས་ན་གཟུགས་སོགས་ནི་མིང་གིས་བཏགས་ཙམ་གྱི་ཆོས་ཡིན་པས]མ་ཁྱབ་སྟེ། ལུང་དང་པོས་ཆོས་བརྡས་ཐ་སྙད་བཏགས་པར་བཤད་ཀྱི་ཐ་སྙད་བཏགས་ཙམ་དུ་མ་བཤད་ལ། མདོའི་ལུང་དོན་གཟུགས་སོགས་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་གློ་བུར་དུ་མིང་གིས་བཏགས་ཙམ་ཡིན་ཞེས་པའི་དོན་ཡིན་ཏེ། དང་པོ་ནས་བདེན་པར་མ་གྲུབ་པས་ན་གློ་བུར་དང་། བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་མིང་བརྡས་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡིན་ཞེས་བཤད་དགོས་པའི་ཕྱིར། ཉི་ཁྲི་རྣམ་ངེས་ལས། དང་པོ་ཉིད་ནས་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་མེད་པ་ནི་གློ་བུར་དུ་བྱུང་བའོ། །བརྡར་བཏགས་པ་ནི་མིང་དུ་བཏགས་པའོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

9. Moreover, someone says: If [something] does not appear as horses and elephants, it is necessarily the case that appearances [that is, perceptions] as horses and elephants do not exist.

ཡང་ཁ་ཅིག རྟ་གླང་དུ་མི་སྣང་ན་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་བ་མེད་པས་ཁྱབ་ཟེར་ན།

Our response: It [absurdly] follows that with respect to the subjects, objects of knowledge, appearances [that is, perceptions] as horses and elephants do not exist because of not appearing as horses and elephants. You have accepted the entailment [that if something does not appear as horses and elephants, it is necessarily the case that appearances (that is, perceptions) as horses and elephants do not exist].

འོ་ན་ཤེས་བྱ་ཆོས་ཅན། རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་བ་མེད་པར་ཐལ། རྟ་གླང་དུ་མི་སྣང་བའི་ཕྱིར། [རྟ་གླང་དུ་མི་སྣང་ན་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་བ་མེད་པས་]ཁྱབ་པ་ཁས།

If you say that it is not established [that objects of knowledge do not appear as horses and elephants], then it [absurdly] follows that whatever is selfless must appear as horses and elephants because [according to you] it is not established [that objects of knowledge do not appear as horses and elephants].

If you accept the root [consequence that appearances (that is, perceptions) as horses and elephants do not exist], it [absurdly] follows that a conceptual consciousness apprehending objects of knowledge as horses and elephants does not exist because you have accepted [that appearances (that is, perceptions) as horses and elephants do not exist]. If you accept [that a conceptual consciousness apprehending an object of knowledge as horses and elephants does not exist], it very [absurdly] follows that the possibility [or border] of mistake has been blocked.

[ཤེས་བྱ་རྟ་གླང་དུ་མི་སྣང་བ་]མ་གྲུབ་ན། བདག་མེད་ཡིན་ན་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་བ་ཡིན་དགོས་པར་ཐལ། [ཤེས་བྱ་རྟ་གླང་དུ་མི་སྣང་བ་]མ་གྲུབ་པ་དེའི་ཕྱིར། [ཤེས་བྱ་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་བ་མེད་པ་]རྩ་བར་འདོད་ན། ཤེས་བྱ་རྟ་གླང་དུ་འཛིན་པའི་རྟོག་པ་མེད་པར་ཐལ། [ཤེས་བྱ་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་བ་མེད་པར་]འདོད་པའི་ཕྱིར། [ཤེས་བྱ་རྟ་གླང་དུ་འཛིན་པའི་རྟོག་པ་མེད་པར་]འདོད་ན། འཁྲུལ་བའི་མཐའ་ཁེགས་པར་ཐལ་ལོ། །

Moreover, it [absurdly] follows that with respect to the subject, the noumenon, appearance [that is, perception] as truly established does not exist because of not appearing as truly established. You have accepted [that

not appearing as truly established] entails [that appearance (that is, perception) as truly established does not exist].

If you say that it is not established [that the noumenon does not appear as truly established], it [absurdly] follows that the subject, [the noumenon,] is not established in accordance with its appearance because [according to you] it is not established [that the noumenon does not appear as truly established]. If you accept [that the noumenon is not established in accordance with its appearance], it [absurdly] follows that that subject, [the noumenon,] is not a truth because you have accepted [that the noumenon is not established in accordance with its appearance]. [Not being established in accordance with its appearance] entails [not being a truth] because the difference between truth and falsity must be posited by whether the phenomenon is established or not in accordance with its mode of appearance. If you accept the root [consequence that with respect to the noumenon, appearance (that is, perception) as truly established does not exist], it very absurdly follows that apprehension of the noumenon as truly established does not exist.

གཞན་ཡང་ཆོས་ཉིད་ཆོས་ཅན། བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་སྣང་བ་མེད་པར་ཐལ། བདེན་[191b]གྲུབ་ཏུ་མི་སྣང་བའི་ཕྱིར། [བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་མི་སྣང་ན་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་སྣང་བ་མེད་པས་]ཁྱབ་པ་ཁས། [ཆོས་ཉིད་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་མི་སྣང་བར་]མ་གྲུབ་ན། [ཆོས་ཉིད་]དེ་ཆོས་ཅན། སྣང་བ་ལྟར་མ་གྲུབ་པར་ཐལ། [བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་མི་སྣང་བར་]མ་གྲུབ་པ་དེའི་ཕྱིར། [ཆོས་ཉིད་སྣང་བ་ལྟར་མ་གྲུབ་པར་]འདོད་ན། [ཆོས་ཉིད་]དེ་ཆོས་ཅན། བདེན་པ་མ་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། [ཆོས་ཉིད་སྣང་བ་ལྟར་མ་གྲུབ་པར་]འདོད་པ་དེའི་[261]ཕྱིར། [སྣང་བ་ལྟར་མ་གྲུབ་ན་བདེན་པ་མ་ཡིན་པས་]ཁྱབ་སྟེ། བདེན་རྫུན་གྱི་ཁྱད་པར་སྣང་ཚུལ་ལྟར་ཆོས་དེ་གྲུབ་མ་གྲུབ་ཀྱིས་འཇོག་དགོས་པའི་ཕྱིར། [ཆོས་ཉིད་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཏུ་སྣང་བ་མེད་པ་]རྩ་བར་འདོད་ན། ཆོས་ཉིད་བདེན་འཛིན་མེད་པར་ཐལ་ལོ། །

10. Moreover, someone says: The lack of being either one truth or many truths is a correct sign proving that a sprout is truthless.

ཡང་ཁ་ཅིག་ན་རེ། བདེན་པའི་གཅིག་དང་དུ་མ་གང་རུང་དང་བྲལ་བ་མྱུ་གུ་བདེན་མེད་དུ་སྒྲུབ་པའི་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་ཟེར་ན།

Our response: Well then, it [absurdly] follows that it is unreasonable to individually posit one truth and many truths because [according to you] the thesis [that the lack of being either one truth or many truths is a correct sign proving that a sprout is truthless] is logically feasible. You cannot accept [that it is unreasonable to individually posit one truth or many truths] because (1) the noumenon of a pot is one truth and (2) the noumena of a pillar and a pot are many truths. The first [part of the] reason [which is that the noumenon of a pot is one truth] is established because [the noumenon of a pot] is a common locus of truth and one. It follows [that the noumenon of a pot is a common locus of truth and one] because truth and one are not contradictory. (2) The second [part of] the reason [which is that the noumena of a pillar and a pot are many truths] is established because [the noumena of a pillar and a pot] are a common locus of truth and many. It follows [that the noumena of a pillar and a pot are a common locus of truth and many] because of being a common locus of truth and two.

འོ་ན། བདེན་པའི་གཅིག་དང་དུ་མ་སོ་སོར་འཇོག་མི་རིགས་པར་ཐལ། དམ་བཅའ་འཐད་པའི་ཕྱིར། [བདེན་པའི་གཅིག་དང་དུ་མ་སོ་སོར་འཇོག་མི་རིགས་པར་]འདོད་མི་ནུས་ཏེ། བུམ་པའི་ཆོས་ཉིད་དེ་བདེན་པའི་གཅིག་དང་། ཀ་བུམ་གྱི་ཆོས་ཉིད་གཉིས་བདེན་པའི་དུ་མ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། དང་པོ་[བུམ་པའི་ཆོས་ཉིད་དེ་བདེན་པའི་གཅིག་ཡིན་པ་]གྲུབ་སྟེ། [བུམ་པའི་ཆོས་ཉིད་དེ་]བདེན་པ་དང་གཅིག་གི་གཞི་མཐུན་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [བུམ་པའི་ཆོས་ཉིད་]དེ་[བདེན་པ་དང་གཅིག་གི་གཞི་མཐུན་ཡིན་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། བདེན་པ་དང་གཅིག་མི་འགལ་བའི་ཕྱིར། གཉིས་པ་[ཀ་བུམ་གྱི་ཆོས་ཉིད་གཉིས་བདེན་པའི་དུ་མ་ཡིན་པ་]གྲུབ་སྟེ། [ཀ་བུམ་གྱི་ཆོས་ཉིད་གཉིས་]བདེན་པ་དང་དུ་མའི་གཞི་མཐུན་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [ཀ་བུམ་གྱི་ཆོས་ཉིད་གཉིས་བདེན་པ་དང་དུ་མའི་གཞི་མཐུན་ཡིན་པ་]དེར་

ཐལ། བདེན་པ་དང་གཉིས་ཀྱི་གཞི་མཐུན་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

11. Moreover, with regard to statements by the omniscient Khay-drub and so forth that the lack of being either truly established one or many is a correct sign—proving only a convention—that proves persons as truthless,[a] ***someone states a qualm by the supreme scholar-monk Jam-yang-leg-chö-pa:***[b] Well then, it [absurdly] follows that that a person is not established as either truly established one with or discrete from the aggregates is the meaning of the truthlessness of a person because non-establishment in that way is a correct sign proving conventions that proves [the truthless of a person]. You have accepted the reason [which is that non-establishment in that way is a correct sign proving conventions that proves the truthless of a person]. If you accept [the consequence that that a person is not established as either truly established one with or discrete from the aggregates is the meaning of the truthlessness of a person], it [absurdly] follows that that a person is not truly established one with the aggregates is the meaning of a person's truthlessness because you have accepted [that that a person is not established as either truly established one with or discrete from the aggregates is the meaning of the truthlessness of a person].

ཡང་མཁས་གྲུབ་ཐམས་ཅད་མཁྱེན་པ་སོགས་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་དང་དུ་མ་གང་རུང་དང་བྲལ་བ་དེ་གང་ཟག་བདེན་མེད་དུ་སྒྲུབ་པའི་ཐ་སྙད་འབའ་ཞིག་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་ཡིན་གསུངས་པ་ལ། མཁས་མཆོག་ལེགས་ཆོས་པའི་དོགས་པ་བཀོད་པ་ན་རེ། འོ་ན། གང་ཟག་ཕུང་པོ་དང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་དང་དུ་མ་གང་རུང་དུ་མ་གྲུབ་པ་དེ་གང་[192a]ཟག་བདེན་མེད་ཀྱི་དོན་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། དེ་ལྟར་མ་གྲུབ་པ་དེ་དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་ཐ་སྙད་འབའ་ཞིག་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [དེ་ལྟར་མ་གྲུབ་པ་དེ་དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་ཐ་སྙད་འབའ་ཞིག་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་ཡིན་པ་]རྟགས་ཁས། [གང་

[a] "Truthless" (*bden med/ bden par med pa*) means "without true existence," or its equivalent "without true establishment" (*bden par ma grub pa*).

[b] *'jam dbyangs legs chos pa,* 15th century C.E.

ཟག་ཕུང་པོ་དང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་དང་ཐ་མ་གང་རུང་དུ་མ་གྲུབ་པ་དེ་གང་ཟག་བདེན་མེད་ཀྱི་དོན་ཡིན་པར་]འདོད་ན། གང་ཟག་ཕུང་པོ་དང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་མ་ཡིན་པ་དེ་བདེན་མེད་ཀྱི་དོན་དུ་ཐལ། [གང་ཟག་ཕུང་པོ་དང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་དང་ཐ་མ་གང་རུང་དུ་མ་གྲུབ་པ་དེ་གང་ཟག་བདེན་མེད་ཀྱི་དོན་ཡིན་པར་] འདོད་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: At this point, [that a person is not established as either truly established one with or discrete from the aggregates is the meaning of the truthlessness of a person] does not entail [that a person is not truly established one with the aggregates is the meaning of a person's truthlessness]. If you accept [that that a person is not truly established one with the aggregates is the meaning of a person's truthlessness], it very absurdly follows that that sound is not established as one with permanence is the meaning of sound's emptiness of permanence.

འདིར་[གང་ཟག་ཕུང་པོ་དང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་དང་ཐ་མ་གང་རུང་དུ་མ་གྲུབ་པ་དེ་གང་ཟག་བདེན་མེད་ཀྱི་དོན་ཡིན་ན་གང་ཟག་ཕུང་པོ་དང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་མ་ཡིན་པ་དེ་བདེན་མེད་ཀྱི་དོན་ཡིན་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ། [གང་ཟག་ཕུང་པོ་དང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་མ་ཡིན་པ་དེ་བདེན་མེད་ཀྱི་དོན་དུ་]འདོད་ན། སྒྲ་རྟག་པ་དང་གཅིག་ཏུ་མ་གྲུབ་པ་སྒྲ་རྟག་པས་སྟོང་པའི་དོན་དུ་ཐལ་ལོ།།

12. Furthermore, someone says: Therefore, the nonexistence of truly established one and the nonexistence of truly established many is not the meaning of truthlessness.

ཡང་ཁོ་ན་རེ། དེས་ན་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་མེད་པ་དང་། བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་དུ་མ་མེད་པ་དག་བདེན་མེད་ཀྱི་དོན་མིན་གསུངས་པ་

Our response: This is a topic for much analysis, but for the time being, [consider] the following: Well then, it [absurdly] follows that the mode of subsistence of one does not exist because [according to you] the nonexistence of truly established one is not [the mode of subsistence of one. If you say that] it is not established [that the nonexistence of truly established one is not the mode of subsistence of one], then it is thrown out that truly established one is utterly not a measure of true [establishment].

If [you say that that the nonexistence of truly established one is not the mode of subsistence of one] does not entail [that the mode of subsistence of one does not exist], and if [you say that] you accept [that the mode of subsistence of one does not exist], it follows that [that the mode of subsistence of one does not exist] is not logically feasible because in the context of the objects of uncontaminated meditative equipoise of Superiors, all eight—ranging from no production, no cessation to no plural meaning and no singular meaning[a] in those objects [of uncontaminated meditative equipoise of Superiors]—are the mode of subsistence,

དཔྱད་གཞི་ཆེ་ཡང་། རེ་ཞིག་འདི་ལྟར། འོ་ན། གཅིག་གི་གནས་ལུགས་མེད་པར་ཐལ། བདེན་པར་གྲུབ་པའི་གཅིག་མེད་པ་དེ་[གཅིག་གི་གནས་ལུགས་]དེ་མ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [བདེན་པར་གྲུབ་པའི་གཅིག་མེད་པ་དེ་གཅིག་གི་གནས་ལུགས་མ་ཡིན་པ་]མ་གྲུབ་ན། བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་དེ་བདེན་ཚད་གཏན་མ་ཡིན་པ་ཐུབ། རྩ་བར་[བདེན་པར་གྲུབ་པའི་གཅིག་མེད་པ་དེ་གཅིག་གི་གནས་ལུགས་མ་ཡིན་ན་གཅིག་གི་གནས་ལུགས་མེད་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ་པ་དང་། [གཅིག་གི་གནས་ལུགས་མེད་པར་]འདོད་ན། [གཅིག་གི་གནས་ལུགས་མེད་པ་]མི་འཐད་པར་ཐལ། འཕགས་པའི་

---

[a] Nāgārjuna at the beginning of his *Fundamental Stanzas on the Middle Called "Wisdom"* makes an expression of worship to the Buddha who taught dependent-arising as qualified by eight negations:

> Homage to the perfect Buddha,
> The best of propounders,
> Who taught that what dependently arises
> Has no cessation, no production,
>
> No annihilation, no permanence,
> No coming, no going,
> No difference, no sameness,
> Is free from proliferations, and at peace.

Cessation, production, annihilation, permanence, coming, going, plural, and singular (the latter two being one and many) do not exist in the face of meditative equipoise realizing emptiness. Using Middle Way reasonings to search for objects, they are not found; thus in meditative equipoise, all dependent-arisings are seen as without production and so forth; this means that in general they lack truly existent production and so forth. Adapted from Hopkins, *Where Is the Middle? Two Views of Reality in the Middle Way: The Autonomy and Consequence Schools,* unpublished manuscript, 27.

མཉམ་བཞག་ཟག་མེད་ཀྱི་ཡུལ་ལ་ལྟོས་ནས་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་པ་འགག་པ་མེད་པ་ནས། ཡུལ་དེ་ལ་དོན་ཏུ་[262]མ་མེད་པ་དང་། དོན་གཅིག་པ་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་པ་བརྒྱད་ཀ་གནས་ལུགས་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར་ཏེ།

because:

Chandrakīrti's *Clear Words* says:[a]

> Now because those conventional dependent-arisings themselves are not inherently produced, in the context of Superiors' pristine wisdom they are qualified with the eight distinctive features of no cessation and so forth, ranging from "They do not have cessation" to "They do not have singular meaning."

and the *Buddhapālita [Commentary]* says:[b]

> […] the supremely profound ultimate truth—no cessation, no production, no annihilation, no permanence, no coming, no going, no different factualities, and no single factuality […]

and Tsong-kha-pa's *Ocean of Reasoning* says:[c]

---

[a] Candrakīrti, *dbu ma rtsa ba'i 'grel pa tshigs gsal ba* (*mūlamadhyamakavṛttiprasannapadā*), in *bstan 'gyur* (*sde dge*), TBRC W23703.102 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 4a.6-4a.7.

[b] Buddhapālita, *dbu ma rtsa ba'i 'grel pa bud+d+ha pA li ta* (*buddhapālitamūlamadhyamakavṛtti*), in *bstan 'gyur* (*sde dge*), TBRC W23703.96 (Delhi, India: Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985), 158b.6.

[c] Tsong kha pa, *dbu ma rtsa ba'i tshig gi le'ur byas pa shes rab ces bya ba'i rnam bshad rigs pa'i rgya mtsho,* in *The Collected Works (gsung 'bum) of rJe Tsong-kha-pa Blo-bzang-grags-pa: Reproduced from an example of the old Bkra-sis-lhun-po redaction from the library of Klu 'Khyil monastery of Ladakh* (New Delhi, India: Ngawang Gelek Demo, 1975), 12b.1-2. Jam-yang-shay-pa's citation differs a little from this edition:

> [Taking dependent-arisings as the substrata, the nonexistence of the eight, cessation and so forth,] in the context of the nature of the objects of uncontaminated meditative equipoise [are associated as their attributes].
> [རྟེན་འབྱུང་དེ་ཁྱད་པར་གྱི་གཞིར་བཟུང་ནས་]མཉམ་གཞག་ཟག་མེད་**ཡེ་ཤེས**་ཀྱི་ཡུལ་གྱི་རང་བཞིན་ལ་ལྟོས་ནས་[འགག་སོགས་བརྒྱད་མེད་པ་དེའི་ཁྱད་པར་གྱི་ཆོས་སུ་སྦྱར་རོ།།]

> in the context of the nature of the objects of uncontaminated meditative equipoise

and so forth.

ཚིག་གསལ་ལས། ད་ནི་རྟེན་ཅིང་འབྲེལ་བར་འབྱུང་བ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་པ་དེ་ཉིད་རང་བཞིན་གྱིས་མ་སྐྱེས་པ་ཉིད་ཀྱི་ཕྱིར་འཕགས་པའི་ཡེ་ཤེས་ལ་ལྟོས་ནས་འདི་ལ་འགག་པ་ཡོད་པ་མིན་པ་ནས་འདི་ལ་དོན་གཅིག་པ་ཡོད་པ་མིན་པ་ཞེས་བྱ་བའི་བར་འགག་པ་མེད་པ་ལ་སོགས་པ་ཁྱད་པར་བརྒྱད་ཀྱིས་[192b]ཁྱད་པར་དུ་བྱེད་དེ། ཞེས་དང་། བུདྡྷ་པཱ་ལི་ཏ་ལས། དོན་དམ་པའི་བདེན་པ་མཆོག་ཏུ་ཟབ་པ་འགག་པ་མེད་པ། སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་པ། ཆད་པ་མེད་པ། རྟག་པ་མེད་པ། འོངས་པ་མེད་པ། འགྲོ་བ་མེད་པ། དོན་ཐ་དད་པ་མིན་པ། དོན་གཅིག་པ་མིན་པ། ཞེས་དང་། རིགས་པའི་རྒྱ་མཚོ་ལས། མཉམ་བཞག་ཟག་མེད་ཀྱི་ཡུལ་གྱི་རང་བཞིན་ལ་ལྟོས་ནས། ཞེས་སོགས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

[These three statements] entail [that in the context of the objects of uncontaminated meditative equipoise of Superiors, all eight—ranging from no production, no cessation through to no plural meaning and no singular meaning in those objects (of uncontaminated meditative equipoise of Superiors)—are the mode of subsistence] because there exist an exclusionary elimination (*rnam bcad, viccheda*) and an inclusionary elimination (*yongs bcad, pariccheda*) in the mention—by those scriptural passages—of "conventional" [in "conventional dependent-arisings" in Chandrakīrti's *Clear Words*] and "ultimate" [in "the supremely profound ultimate truth" in the *Buddhapālita Commentary*].

[འདི་འདྲ་གསུངས་པ་ཡིན་ན་འཕགས་པའི་མཉམ་བཞག་ཟག་མེད་ཀྱི་ཡུལ་ལ་ལྟོས་ནས་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་པ་འགག་པ་མེད་པ་ནས། ཡུལ་དེ་ལ་དོན་དུ་མ་མེད་པ་དང་། དོན་གཅིག་པ་ཡོད་པ་མ་ཡིན་པ་བརྒྱད་ཀ་གནས་ལུགས་ཡིན་པས་]ཁྱབ་སྟེ། ལུང་དེ་

དག་གིས་ཀུན་རྫོབ་དང་དོན་དམ་ཞེས་བཤད་པའི་རྣམ་བཅད་ཡོངས་གཅོད་ཡོད་པའི་ཕྱིར།

Moreover, it follows that—with regard to the subject, all eight such as production, cessation, and so forth—the nonexistence of these in the perspective of the uncontaminated meditative equipoise of Superiors is their mode of subsistence because they are conventionalities. If [you say that its being a conventionality] does not entail [that its nonexistence in the perspective of uncontaminated meditative equipoise of Superiors is its mode of subsistence], this contradicts many sūtras and treatises of definitive meaning such as the *Verse Summary [of the Perfection of Wisdom] Sūtra*[a] and so forth.

གཞན་ཡང་སྐྱེ་འགག་སོགས་བརྒྱད་པོ་ཆོས་ཅན། འཕགས་པའི་མཉམ་བཞག་ཟག་མེད་ཀྱི་ངོར་ཁྱོད་མེད་པ་ཁྱོད་ཀྱི་གནས་ལུགས་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། ཁྱོད་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [ཁྱོད་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཡིན་ན་འཕགས་པའི་མཉམ་བཞག་ཟག་མེད་ཀྱི་ངོར་ཁྱོད་མེད་པ་ཁྱོད་ཀྱི་གནས་ལུགས་ཡིན་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ་ན་མདོ་སྡུད་པ་སོགས་ངེས་དོན་གྱི་མདོ་བསྟན་བཅོས་དུ་མ་དང་འགལ་ལོ།

Furthermore, it [absurdly] follows that the distinction that the absence of the true existence of "I" (*nga bden par med pa*)[b] is emptiness, but the nonexistence of truly established "I" (*bden grub kyi nga med pa*) is not emptiness is logically feasible because [according to you] the absence of the true existence of one (*gcig bden par med pa*) is emptiness, but the nonexistence of truly established one (*bden grub kyi gcig med pa*) is not emptiness. You have asserted the reason [which is that the absence of the true existence of one (*gcig bden par med pa*) is emptiness, but the nonexistence of truly established one (bden grub kyi gcig med pa) is not emptiness]. If

[a] *shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa sdud pa tshigs su bcad pa, prajñāpāramitāsañcayagāthā;* Peking 735, vol. 21; Tohoku 13, vol. ka (*shes rab sna tshogs*).

[b] The point here is that in Tibetan *nga bden par med pa* looks as if it means "non-truly-existent I," which would be an affirming negative; however, it is taken to mean "absence of the true existence of I," which is a nonaffirming negative and thus a fully qualified emptiness that is the mode of subsistence. (The quote markers around I in the translation are merely for the sake of indicating that the word is not the roman numeral one.)

you accept [that the distinction that the absence of the true existence of "I" (*nga bden par med pa*) is emptiness, but the nonexistence of truly established "I" (*bden grub kyi nga med pa*) is not emptiness is logically feasible], it very [absurdly] follows that the view apprehending in thought an "I" qualified with true establishment is not the subtle view of transitory.

གཞན་ཡང་ང་བདེན་པར་མེད་པ་སྟོང་ཉིད་ཡིན་ལ་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་ང་མེད་པ་སྟོང་ཉིད་མ་ཡིན་པའི་ཁྱད་པར་འཐད་པར་ཐལ། གཅིག་བདེན་པར་མེད་པ་སྟོང་ཉིད་ཡིན་ལ་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་མེད་པ་སྟོང་ཉིད་མ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། རྟགས་ཁས། འདོད་ན། བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱིས་ཁྱད་པར་དུ་བྱས་པའི་ངའོ་སྙམ་དུ་འཛིན་པའི་ལྟ་བ་དེ་འཇིག་ལྟ་ཕྲ་མོ་མ་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ་ལོ། །

13. With regard to that, someone says: It follows that the nonproduction of the mode of subsistence is not ascertained with valid cognition by the Proponents of Mind-Only because the nonexistence of truly established production is not ascertained with valid cognition by the Proponents of Mind-Only]. You have accepted the reason [which is that the nonexistence of truly established production is not ascertained with valid cognition by the Proponents of Mind-Only]. If you accept [that the nonproduction of the mode of subsistence is not ascertained with valid cognition by the Proponents of Mind-Only], it follows that the Proponents of Mind-Only do not realize with valid cognition that the mode of subsistence is a non-thing because you have accepted [that the nonproduction of the mode of subsistence is not ascertained with valid cognition by the Proponents of Mind-Only].

བྱས་པ་ལ་ཁོ་ན་རེ། གནས་ལུགས་ཀྱི་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་པ་སེམས་ཙམ་པས་ཚད་མས་མ་ངེས་པར་ཐལ། བདེན་པའི་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་པ་ལ་[སེམས་ཙམ་པས་ཚད་མས་མ་ངེས་པ་]དེའི་ཕྱིར། [བདེན་པའི་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་པ་སེམས་ཙམ་པས་ཚད་མས་མ་ངེས་པ་]རྟགས་ཁས། [གནས་ལུགས་ཀྱི་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་པ་སེམས་ཙམ་པས་ཚད་མས་མ་ངེས་པར་]འདོད་ན། སེམས་ཙམ་པས་གནས་ལུགས་དངོས་[193a]མེད་དུ་ཚད་མས་མ་རྟོགས་པར་ཐལ། [གནས་

ལུགས་ཀྱི་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་པ་སེམས་ཙམ་པས་ཚད་མས་མ་ངེས་པར་]འདོད་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: [That we assert that the nonproduction of truly established production is not ascertained with valid cognition by the Proponents of Mind-Only] does not entail [that the nonproduction of the mode of subsistence is not ascertained with valid cognition by the Proponents of Mind-Only]. Well then, it [absurdly] follows that the Consequentialists assert a subtler system of non-thing than the assertion by the Proponents of Mind-Only that space is a non-thing because with regard to the measure of establishment of space as [its own] mode of subsistence, the Consequentialists assert a subtler measure of establishment of space as [its own] mode of subsistence than the Proponents of Mind-Only. You have asserted the three spheres [of self-contradiction].

[བདེན་པའི་སྐྱེ་བ་མེད་པ་སེམས་ཙམ་པས་ཚད་མས་མ་ངེས་པར་འདོད་ན་སེམས་ཙམ་པས་གནས་ལུགས་དངོས་མེད་དུ་ཚད་མས་མ་རྟོགས་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ། འོ་ན། ནམ་མཁའ་དངོས་མེད་དུ་སེམས་ཙམ་པས་འདོད་པ་ལས་ཕྲ་བའི་དངོས་པོ་མེད་ལུགས་གཅིག་ཐལ་འགྱུར་བ་འདི་པས་འདོད་པར་ཐལ། ནམ་མཁའ་གནས་ལུགས་སུ་གྲུབ་ཚད་ལ་སེམས་ཙམ་པ་ལས་ཕྲ་བ་གཅིག་ཐལ་འགྱུར་བ་འདི་པས་འདོད་པའི་ཕྱིར། འཁོར་[263]གསུམ།

It follows [that with regard to the measure of establishment of space as (its own) mode of subsistence, the Consequentialists assert a subtler measure of establishment of space as (its own) mode of subsistence than the Proponents of Mind-Only] because (1) the Consequentialists assert space's establishment from its own side as the measure of establishment of space as [its own] mode of subsistence, and (2) nobody from the Autonomists on down asserts such. You have asserted the three spheres [of self-contradiction].

[ནམ་མཁའ་གནས་ལུགས་སུ་གྲུབ་ཚད་ལ་སེམས་ཙམ་པ་ལས་ཕྲ་བ་གཅིག་ཐལ་འགྱུར་བ་འདི་པས་འདོད་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། ཐལ་འགྱུར་བ་འདི་པས་ནམ་མཁའ་

རང་ངོས་ནས་གྲུབ་པ་དེ། ནམ་མཁའ་གནས་ལུགས་སུ་གྲུབ་ཚད་དུ་འདོད། རང་རྒྱུད་པ་མན་ཆད་སུ་ཡང་དེ་ལྟར་མི་འདོད་པའི་ཕྱིར། འཁོར་གསུམ།

14. With regard to that, someone says: I accept the root [consequence that the Consequentialists assert a subtler system of non-thing than the assertion by the Proponents of Mind-Only that space is a non-thing] because space that is not established from its own side is a non-thing.

ཟེར་བ་ལ་ཁོ་ན་རེ། [ནམ་མཁའ་དངོས་མེད་དུ་སེམས་ཙམ་པས་འདོད་པ་ལས་ཕྲ་བའི་དངོས་པོ་མེད་ལུགས་གཅིག་ཐལ་འགྱུར་བ་འདི་པས་འདོད་པ་]རྩ་བར་འདོད་པ་ཡིན་ཏེ། རང་ངོས་ནས་མ་གྲུབ་པའི་ནམ་མཁའ་དངོས་མེད་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར་ཟེར་ན།

Our response: Well then, it [absurdly] follows that in the system of the Consequentialists even in order to realize that a basis [that is, a phenomenon] is a non-thing, it must be qualified by the absence of inherent existence because [according to you] the Consequentialists assert a subtler system of non-thing than the assertion by the Proponents of Mind-Only that space is a non-thing]. If you accept [that in the system of the Consequentialists even in order to realize that a basis (that is, a phenomenon) is a non-thing, it must be qualified by the absence of inherent existence], it very [absurdly] follows that even realization that a pot is an [effective] thing must be qualified by the absence of inherent existence! If you accept [that even realization that a pot is an (effective) thing must be qualified by the absence of inherent existence], it would [absurdly] be that no phenomenon is established with valid cognition by anyone except the Consequentialists!

འོ་ན་ཐལ་འགྱུར་བའི་ལུགས་ལ་གཞི་དངོས་མེད་དུ་རྟོགས་པ་ལ་ཡང་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པས་ཁྱད་པར་དུ་བྱེད་དགོས་པར་ཐལ། [ནམ་མཁའ་དངོས་མེད་དུ་སེམས་ཙམ་པས་འདོད་པ་ལས་ཕྲ་བའི་དངོས་པོ་མེད་ལུགས་གཅིག་ཐལ་འགྱུར་བ་འདི་པས་]འདོད་པའི་ཕྱིར། [ཐལ་འགྱུར་བའི་ལུགས་ལ་གཞི་དངོས་མེད་དུ་རྟོགས་པ་ལ་ཡང་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པས་ཁྱད་པར་དུ་བྱེད་

དགོས་པ་]འདོད་ན། བུམ་པ་དངོས་པོར་རྟོགས་པའང་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པས་ཁྱད་པར་དུ་བྱེད་དགོས་པར་ཐལ་ལོ། ། [བུམ་པ་དངོས་པོར་རྟོགས་པའང་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པས་ཁྱད་པར་དུ་བྱེད་དགོས་པ་]འདོད་ན། ཐལ་འགྱུར་བ་མ་གཏོགས་སུས་ཀྱང་ཆོས་གང་ཡང་ཚད་མས་མ་གྲུབ་པར་འགྱུར་རོ། །

Moreover, it [absurdly] follows that with respect to the assertion by the Proponents of True Existence[a] that the self and the aggregates are the same entity from their own side but different isolates from their own side, there is no fallacy of their having come to assert that the self and the aggregates are both truly established one and truly established different because [according to you] the Proponents of True Existence do not assert, "Although the two, the self and the aggregates, are truly established, [the self and the aggregates] are the two, truly established one and truly established many."

གཞན་ཡང་དངོས་སྨྲ་བས་བདག་ཕུང་རང་ངོས་ནས་ངོ་བོ་གཅིག་ལ་རང་ངོས་ནས་ལྡོག་པ་ཐ་དད་དུ་ཁས་བླངས་པ་ལ་བདག་ཕུང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་དང་ཐ་དད་གཉིས་ཀར་ཁས་བླངས་སོང་བའི་སྐྱོན་མེད་པར་ཐལ། དངོས་སྨྲ་བས་བདག་ཕུང་གཉིས་[193b]བདེན་གྲུབ་ཡིན་ཡང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་དང་དུ་མ་གཉིས་ཡིན་ཞེས་མི་འདོད་པའི་ཕྱིར།

You have asserted [the entailment, namely that the nonassertion by Proponents of True Existence that "The self and the aggregates are the two, truly established one and truly established many" despite asserting that the two, the self and the aggregates, are truly established] entails [that with respect to the assertion by the Proponents of True Existence that the self and the aggregates are the same entity from its own side, but different isolates from their own side, there is no fallacy of having come to assert that

[a] The Proponents of Mind-Only and below.

the self and the aggregates are both truly established one and truly established different]. You have come to assert the reason [which is that the Proponents of True Existence do not assert, "Although the two, the self and the aggregates, are truly established, [the self and the aggregates] are the two, truly established one and truly established many."] It [absurdly] follows [that the Proponents of True Existence do not assert, "Although the two, the self and the aggregates, are truly established, [the self and the aggregates] are the two, truly established one and truly established many"] because [according to you] those [Proponents of True Existence] have realized that the self and the aggregates are not truly established one. You have asserted the reason [which is that those Proponents of True Existence have realized that the self and the aggregates are not truly established one]. It [absurdly] follows [that those Proponents of True Existence have realized that the self and the aggregates are not truly established one] because [according to you] the non-establishment of the self and the aggregates as one entity from its own side is not emptiness.

[དངོས་སྨྲ་བས་བདག་ཕུང་གཉིས་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཡིན་ཡང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་དང་དུ་མ་གཉིས་ཡིན་ཞེས་མི་འདོད་ན་དངོས་སྨྲ་བས་བདག་ཕུང་རང་ངོས་ནས་ངོ་བོ་གཅིག་ལ་རང་ངོས་ནས་ཐོག་པ་ཐ་དད་དུ་ཁས་བླངས་པ་ལ་བདག་ཕུང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་དང་ཐ་དད་གཉིས་ཀར་ཁས་བླངས་སོང་བའི་སྐྱོན་མེད་པ་ཡིན་པས་]ཁྱབ་པ་ཁས། [དངོས་སྨྲ་བས་བདག་ཕུང་གཉིས་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཡིན་ཡང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་དང་དུ་མ་གཉིས་ཡིན་ཞེས་མི་འདོད་པ་]རྟགས་སོང་། [དངོས་སྨྲ་བས་བདག་ཕུང་གཉིས་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཡིན་ཡང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་དང་དུ་མ་གཉིས་ཡིན་ཞེས་མི་འདོད་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། [དངོས་སྨྲ་བ་]དེས་བདག་ཕུང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་མ་ཡིན་པར་རྟོགས་ཟིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [(དངོས་སྨྲ་བ་)དེས་བདག་ཕུང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་མ་ཡིན་པར་རྟོགས་ཟིན་པ་]རྟགས་ཁས། [(དངོས་སྨྲ་བ་)དེས་བདག་ཕུང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་མ་ཡིན་པར་རྟོགས་ཟིན་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། བདག་ཕུང་རང་ངོས་ནས་ངོ་བོ་གཅིག་ཏུ་མ་གྲུབ་པ་སྟོང་ཉིད་མ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

Moreover, it follows that the lack of being truly established one and

many is a correct sign—proving only a convention—that proves that the self and the aggregates are not truly established because although the meaning of the absence of true establishment has already been established in the perspective of awareness by a full-fledged opponent for the proof of that [that is, for the proof that the self and the aggregates are not truly established, the lack of being truly established one and many] proves only the terminology and convention of the absence of true establishment in the probandum of the proof of that [that is, in the proof that the self and the aggregates are not truly established].

གཞན་ཡང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་གཅིག་དུ་བྲལ་དེ། བདག་དང་ཕུང་པོ་བདེན་མེད་དུ་སྒྲུབ་པའི་ཐ་སྙད་འབའ་ཞིག་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་རྟགས་ཡང་དག་ཏུ་ཐལ། དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་ཕྱི་རྒོལ་ཡང་དག་གིས་བདེན་མེད་ཀྱི་དོན་བློ་ངོར་གྲུབ་ཟིན་ཀྱང་། དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱ་ལ་བདེན་མེད་ཀྱི་བརྡ་དང་ཐ་སྙད་ཁོ་ན་སྒྲུབ་པ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

It follows [that although the meaning of the absence of true establishment has already been established in the perspective of awareness by a full-fledged opponent for the proof of that, that is, for the proof that the self and the aggregates are not truly established, the lack of being truly established one and many proves only the terminology and convention of the absence of true establishment in the probandum of the proof of that, that is, in the proof that the self and the aggregates are not truly established] because although at that time the meaning of the absence of true establishment has been ascertained from the sign, the association of terminology [that is, conceptual consciousness (*rtog pa*)] thinking with regard to the probandum "These are not truly established" and of the verbal convention "[These] are not truly established" is meaningful,

[དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་ཕྱི་རྒོལ་ཡང་དག་གིས་བདེན་མེད་ཀྱི་དོན་བློ་ངོར་གྲུབ་ཟིན་ཀྱང་། དེ་སྒྲུབ་ཀྱི་བསྒྲུབ་བྱ་ལ་བདེན་མེད་ཀྱི་བརྡ་དང་ཐ་སྙད་ཁོ་ན་སྒྲུབ་པ་ཡིན་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། དེའི་ཚེ་རྟགས་ལས་བདེན་མེད་ཀྱི་དོན་ངེས་ཀྱང་བསྒྲུབ་བྱ་ལ་འདི་བདེན་མེད་དོ་སྙམ་པའི་བརྡ་དང་བདེན་མེད་དོ་ཞེས་པའི་སྒྲའི་ཐ་སྙད་སྦྱོར་བ་དོན་ཡོད་པའི་ཕྱིར་ཏེ།

because, for example, it is like the fact that although the meaning of an ox is established when one sees a sentient corporeal mass with hump and dewlap, the association of the mere terminology "This is an ox" is meaningful for a person who needs to make the terminological connection, because Shāntarakṣhita's *Autocommentary [on the Ornament for the Middle]* says:

> No part of the meaning of the thesis exists in this reason because the conventions of knowledge [thinking that this is an ox] and terminology [using the term, "ox"] of the object-possessor are established by the established object [that is, the reason]; for example, this is an ox because of being an entity that is an aggregation of dewlap and so forth.

Since the topics concerning this are difficult points, there appears to be much to be propounded, but having qualms that such would harm the meaning of the general run [of this text], I will leave them aside.

དཔེར་ན། ནོག་དང་ལྐོག་ཤལ་དང་ལྡན་པའི་སེམས་ཅན་གྱི་གོང་བུ་མཐོང་བ་ན་བ་གླང་གི་དོན་གྲུབ་ཀྱང་བརྡ་སྦྱར་དགོས་ཀྱི་གང་ཟག་ལ་འདི་ནི་བ་གླང་ངོ་ཞེས་བརྡ་འབའ་ཞིག་སྦྱར་བ་དོན་ཡོད་པ་བཞིན་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། དབུ་མ་རྒྱན་རང་འགྲེལ་ལས། གཏན་ཚིགས་འདི་ལ་དམ་བཅས་པའི་དོན་གྱི་ཕྱོགས་[264]གཅིག་པ་ཡང་མེད་དེ་གྲུབ་པའི་ཡུལ་གྱིས་ཡུལ་ཅན་གྱི་ཤེས་པ་དང་སྒྲའི་ཐ་སྙད་རྣམས་གྲུབ་པའི་ཕྱིར་ཏེ། དཔེར་ན། འདི་ནི་བ་གླང་སྟེ་ལྐོག་ཤལ་ལ་སོགས་པ་འདུས་པའི་བདག་ཉིད་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །ཞེས་[194a]གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར། འདི་སྐོར་དཀའ་གནས་ཡིན་པས་སྨྲ་རྒྱུ་མང་པོ་སྣང་ཡང་དཀྱུས་ཀྱི་དོན་ལ་གནོད་དོགས་ནས་གཞག་གོ །

15. Moreover, someone says: Just as although magical illusions appear as horses and elephants, they are empty of those, so although all [phenomena] such as a pot and so forth appear as a pot and so forth, they are empty of a pot and so forth; this emptiness is asserted to be the self-emptiness that is the system of Nāgārjuna.

ཡང་ཁ་ཅིག སྒྱུ་མ་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་ཡང་དེས་སྟོང་པ་བཞིན་དུ་བུམ་སོགས་ཐམས་ཅད་བུམ་སོགས་སུ་སྣང་ཡང་བུམ་སོགས་ཀྱིས་སྟོང་པ་རང་སྟོང་ཀླུ་སྒྲུབ་ལུགས་སུ་འདོད་ཟེར་ན།

Our response: Well then, it [absurdly] follows that it does not occur that any phenomenon is itself because [according to you] that whatsoever phenomenon such as a pot and so forth is empty of itself is the meaning of its being like a magical illusion. You have asserted the reason [which is that whatsoever phenomenon such as a pot and so forth is empty of itself is the meaning of its being like a magical illusion]. If you accept [that it does not occur that any phenomenon is itself,] it very absurdly follows that the subject, self-emptiness, is not self-emptiness! Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation [of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'"]* says:[a]

> Therefore, the significance of applying the example, a magician's illusion, to the meaning—other phenomena—is not at all that just as a magician's illusion appears to be a horse or an elephant but is empty of being such, so all [phenomena] such as pots and so forth appear to be pots and so forth, but are empty of being pots and so forth. For, if that were the case, being that phenomenon [for example, being a pot] would not occur, and the application of the example to the meaning would be that [phenomena] appear to be such-and-such but are not the actual thing.

འོ་ན། ཆོས་གང་ཡང་རང་ཡིན་པ་མི་སྲིད་པར་ཐལ། བུམ་སོགས་ཆོས་གང་ཡང་རང་རང་གིས་སྟོང་པ་དེ་རང་སྒྱུ་མ་ལྟ་བུའི་དོན་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [བུམ་སོགས་ཆོས་གང་ཡང་རང་རང་གིས་སྟོང་པ་དེ་རང་སྒྱུ་མ་ལྟ་བུའི་དོན་ཡིན་པ་]རྟགས་ཁས། [ཆོས་གང་ཡང་རང་ཡིན་པ་མི་སྲིད་པར་]འདོད་ན། རང་སྟོང་ཆོས་ཅན། རང་སྟོང་མ་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ་ལོ། །རྣམ་བཤད་ལས། དེས་ན་སྒྱུ་མ་རྟ་གླང་དུ་སྣང་ཡང་ནས། [དེས་སྟོང་པ་བཞིན་དུ། བུམ་སོགས་ཐམས་ཅད་བུམ་སོགས་སུ་སྣང་ཡང་བུམ་སོགས་

[a] Hopkins, *Tsong-kha-pa's Final Exposition of Wisdom,* 198.

ཀྱིས་སྟོང་པ་ནི། སྒྱུ་མ་དང་ཆོས་གཞན་རྣམས་དཔེ་དོན་དུ་སྦྱོར་བའི་དོན་གཏན་མིན་ཏེ། །དེ་ལྟ་ན་ཆོས་དེ་ཡིན་པ་མི་སྲིད་པར་འགྱུར་ཞིང་། དཔེ་དོན་སྦྱར་བ་ཡང་དེར་སྣང་བ་ཡིན་གྱི་]དེ་དངོས་མ་ཡིན་པར་འགྱུར་བའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་སོ། །

16. Moreover, someone says: Parts-possessors are to be associated only with the physical.

And several say: Parts-possessors are to be associated only with compounded phenomena.

Our response: These are not logically feasible because it must be treated that there is nothing among all [phenomena]—the compounded such as forms and so forth and the uncompounded such as space, nirvāṇa, and so forth that are not necessarily part-possessors. It follows [that it must be treated that there is nothing among all (phenomena)—the compounded such as forms and so forth and the uncompounded such as space, nirvāṇa, and so forth that are not necessarily part-possessors] because doing it that way is the thought of the father Shāntarakṣhita and the son [Kamalashīla] and of the Supramundane Victor,

ཡང་ཁ་ཅིག ཆ་བཅས་གཟུགས་ཅན་ཁོ་ན་དང་ལ་ལ་འདུས་བྱས་ཁོ་ན་ལ་སྦྱོར་བ་རྣམས་མི་འཐད་པར་ཐལ། [ཆ་བཅས་]དེ་གཟུགས་སོགས་འདུས་བྱས་དང་ནམ་མཁའ་དང་མྱང་འདས་སོགས་འདུས་མ་བྱས་ཐམས་ཅད་ལ་མ་ཁྱབ་པ་མེད་པར་སྦྱར་དགོས་པའི་ཕྱིར། [(ཆ་བཅས་)དེ་གཟུགས་སོགས་འདུས་བྱས་དང་ནམ་མཁའ་དང་མྱང་འདས་སོགས་འདུས་མ་བྱས་ཐམས་ཅད་ལ་མ་ཁྱབ་པ་མེད་པར་སྦྱར་དགོས་པ]དེར་ཐལ། དེ་ལྟར་བྱེད་པ་ནི་འཚོ་ཡབ་སྲས་དང་བཅོམ་ལྡན་འདས་ཀྱི་དགོངས་པ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

because of the explanations of the reasoning of the lack being one and many in:

(1) Shāntarakṣhita's *Autocommentary on the Ornament for the Middle:*[a]

> Concerning that, the pervasive are space and so forth. The non-pervasive are gross [objects] and minute particles. Even all of those are indicated[b] as being contradictory with a unitary nature.
>
> > [10.] Because of being related with different factors,
> > How could the pervasive be unitary?
>
> …All uncompounded phenomena such as space and so forth were earlier refuted [as being unitary]. The eighteen constituents are clarified[c] as just being without inherent existence.

(2) [Kamalashīla's] *Commentarial Explanation of Difficult Points in (Shāntarakṣhita's) "Ornament for the Middle":*[d]

> "The unitary" is the partless.

and so forth.

(3) the *Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra:*

> Just as forms devoid of oneness and otherness
> Appear in a mirror,
> But do not exist there,
> So is the nature of things.

(4) the *Meeting of Father and Son Sūtra,* and so forth.

དབུ་མ་རྒྱན་རང་འགྲེལ་ལས། དེ་ལ་ཁྱབ་པ་ནི་ནམ་མཁའ་ལ་སོགས་པའོ། །མ་ཁྱབ་པ་ནི་རགས་པ་དང་རྡུལ་ཕྲ་རབ་རྣམས་སོ། །དེ་དག་ཐམས་ཅད་ཀྱང་གཅིག་པུའི་རང་བཞིན་དང་འགལ་བར་བསྟན་པ། ཐ་དད་ཕྱོགས་དང་འབྲེལ་བས་ན། །ཁྱབ་རྣམས་

[a] Masamichi Ichigō *Madhyamakālaṁkāra of Śāntarakṣita: With His Own Commentary or Vṛtti and with the Subcommentary or Pañjikā of Kamalashīla,* 44, 64.

[b] Correcting *rten* in the 2011 TBRC *bla brang* (194a.6) to *bstan* in accordance with ibid., 44.

[c] Correcting *bsal* in the 2011 TBRC *bla brang* (194b.1) to *gsal* in accordance with ibid., 64.

[d] Ibid., 23.

གཅིག་ཕྱུར་ག་ལ་འགྱུར། །ཞེས་[194b]པ་ནས། ནམ་མཁའ་ལ་སོགས་པ་འདུས་མ་བྱས་མཐའ་དག་ཀྱང་སྔར་བསལ་ཟིན་ཏེ། ཁམས་བཅོ་བརྒྱད་པོ་དག་གི་ནི་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་ཉིད་དུ་གསལ་ལོ། །ཞེས་དང་། འགྲེལ་བཤད་ལས། གཅིག་པ་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ནི་ཆ་མེད་པ་ཉིད་དོ་ཞེས་སོགས་དང་། ལང་གཤེགས་ལས། གཅིག་དང་གཞན་ཉིད་སྤངས་པ་ཡི། །གཟུགས་ནི་ཇི་ལྟར་མི་ལོང་ལ། །སྣང་ཡང་དེ་ན་ཡོད་མ་ཡིན། །དེ་བཞིན་དངོས་པོའི་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད། །ཅེས་དང་། ཡབ་སྲས་མཛལ་བ་སོགས་ལས་གཅིག་དུ་བྲལ་གྱི་གཏན་ཚིགས་བཤད་པ་དེའི་ཕྱིར།

As Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation [of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'"]* says:[a]

> Since this treatment is the assertion of the father Shāntarakṣhita and his spiritual son [Kamalashīla], reckoning part and whole only for effective things is a flaw of those with small intelligence.

ཛེ་སྐད་དུ་རྣམ་བཤད་[265]ལས། དེ་ལྟར་བྱེད་པ་ཞི་འཚོ་ཡབ་སྲས་ཀྱི་བཞེད་པ་ཡིན་པས་ཆ་དང་ཆ་ཅན་དངོས་པོ་ཁོ་ན་ལ་རྩི་བ་བློ་གྲོས་ཆུང་བའི་སྐྱོན་ནོ། །ཞེས་སོ། །

2) Our own system

གཉིས་པ་རང་ལུགས་ནི།

The two, the measure of true establishment and the measure of establishment in conventional terms in this [Autonomy] system, exist because:

- **establishment as its own mode of abiding without being only posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness** is the measure of true establishment, and

[a] Hopkins, *Tsong-kha-pa's Final Exposition of Wisdom,* 200.

- **establishment as only posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness** is the measure of conventional establishment, and
- **an awareness (1) apprehending [phenomena] as established that way [that is, as established as their own mode of abiding without being only posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness] and (2) not polluted by tenets** is an innate conceptual consciousness apprehending true establishment, and
- since an apprehension of true existence obstructs the suchness[a] of reality as if veiling it with a cloth, it is described as "obscurational" (*kun rdzob, saṃvṛti*).

ལུགས་འདིའི་བདེན་པར་གྲུབ་ཚད་དང་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་གྲུབ་ཚད་གཉིས་ཡོད་དེ། བློ་གནོད་མེད་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་མ་ཡིན་པར་རང་གི་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་གྲུབ་པ་དེ་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་ཚད་དང་། བློ་གནོད་མེད་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་དུ་གྲུབ་པ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་གྲུབ་ཚད་དང་། [བློ་གནོད་མེད་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་མ་ཡིན་པར་རང་གི་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་]དེ་ལྟར་གྲུབ་པར་འཛིན་ཅིང་གྲུབ་མཐས་མ་བསླད་པའི་བློ་ནི་བདེན་འཛིན་གྱི་རྟོག་པ་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཡིན་པ་དང་། བདེན་འཛིན་དེས་ཡང་དག་པའི་དེ་ཉིད་ལ་གོས་ཀྱིས་འགེབ་པ་ལྟར་སྒྲིབ་པས་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཅེས་བཤད་པའི་ཕྱིར་ཏེ།

The first [part of the reason, which is that **establishment as its own mode of abiding without being only posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness** is the measure of true establishment,] is established because, within having posited as [our hypothetical] basis that a mode of [true] establishment [exists], the opposite of establishment in conventional terms (*tha snyad du grub pa*) must be taken as true establishment, because of being known from the evidence that the *Descent into*

[a] That is to say, a consciousness apprehending true existence obstructs the perception of suchness.

Laṅkā Sūtra says:[a]

> The production of things [exists] conventionally (*kun rdzob tu, saṃvṛtyā*);
> Ultimately, it lacks inherent existence,

and a Mother Sūtra [a Perfection of Wisdom] says (see above, 105) that forms and so forth exist in conventional terms but do not exist ultimately, because Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation [of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to(Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'"]* (see above, 81) says:

> A clear identification of the object of negation does not emerge in other reliable sourcebooks of the Autonomy School, but the existence that is the opposite of the mode of conventional existence described in Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle* is to be known as ultimate or true existence.

དང་པོ་[བློ་གནོད་མེད་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་མ་ཡིན་པར་རང་གི་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་གྲུབ་པ་དེ་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཀྱི་ཚད་]གྲུབ་སྟེ། གྲུབ་ཚུལ་གཅིག་གཞིར་བཞག་ལ་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་གྲུབ་པའི་བཟློག་ཟླ་བདེན་གྲུབ་ལ་བྱེད་དགོས་པའི་ཕྱིར་ཏེ། ལང་[195a]གཤེགས་ལས། །དངོས་རྣམས་སྐྱེ་བ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ། །དམ་པའི་དོན་དུ་རང་བཞིན་མེད། །ཅེས་དང་། ཡུམ་གྱི་མདོ་ལས། གཟུགས་སོགས་འཇིག་རྟེན་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་ཡོད་ཀྱི་དོན་དམ་པར་མེད་པར་གསུངས་པའི་རྒྱུ་མཚན་ལས་ཤེས་པའི་ཕྱིར། རྣམ་བཤད་ལས། རང་རྒྱུད་པའི་གཞུང་ཁུངས་གཞན་ལས་དགག་བྱ་ངོས་འཛིན་གསལ་བར་མི་འབྱུང་ལ། དབུ་མ་སྣང་བའི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཡོད་ཚུལ་བཤད་པའི་བཟློག་ཕྱོགས་ཀྱི་ཡོད་པ་ནི་དོན་དམ་པར་རམ་བདེན་ཡོད་དུ་ཤེས་པས། ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The second [part of the reason which is that **establishment as only posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness** is the measure of conventional establishment] is established because that the

---

[a] *lang kar gshegs pa'i mdo, laṅkāvatārasūtra,* X.429ab; Sanskrit in Bunyiu Nanjio, *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra,* 319: *bhāvā vidyanti saṃvṛtyā paramārthe na bhāvakāḥ.*

"convention" (*kun rdzob*) in "conventional establishment" and the "conventional terms" (*tha snyad*) in "establishment in conventional terms" must be something not harmed by valid cognition with respect to the meaning of its own object of comprehension is taken as that [measure of conventional establishment].

[That the "convention" (*kun rdzob*) in "conventional establishment" and the "conventional terms" (*tha snyad*) in "establishment in conventional terms" must be something not harmed by valid cognition with respect to the meaning of its own object of comprehension is taken as that (measure of conventional establishment)] follows because the convention (*kun rdzob, saṃvṛti*) in this [conventional establishment (*kun rdzob tu grub pa*)] is not the obscurer (*kun rdzob, saṃvṛti*) that is an apprehension of true existence (*bden 'dzin*) [in obscurational truth (*kun rdzob bden pa, saṃvṛti-sattya*)], because the *Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra* says, "The production of things [exists] conventionally," and in explaining the meaning of this Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle* says:

> Therefore, all entities of false things are said "to merely exist conventionally" through the power of their mentations,

and Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation [of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'"]* (see above, 85) says:[a]

> The "mentations" of those living beings are not just conceptual consciousnesses but also are to be taken as non-conceptual consciousnesses.
>
> False things—that is to say, that do not exist ultimately but are posited as existing through the force of those two [conceptual and non-conceptual consciousnesses]—exist only conventionally. This is the meaning of the statement in the [*Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra*], "The production of things [exists] conventionally (*kun rdzob tu, saṃvṛtyā*)." Moreover, this does not mean that [such falsities] exist conventionally in the sense of existing for a *saṃvṛti* (*kun rdzob*) that is an apprehender of true existence. [Rather, they exist for a *saṃvṛti* (*kun rdzob*) that is a conventional valid consciousness.]

གཉིས་པ་[བློ་གནོད་མེད་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་དུ་གྲུབ་པ་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་གྲུབ་ཚད་]གྲུབ་སྟེ། ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་གྲུབ་པ་དང་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་གྲུབ་པ་

[a] Adapting Hopkins' "thoughts" to "mentations."

ཞེས་པའི་ཀུན་རྟོབ་དང་ཐ་སྙད་ལ་རང་གི་གཞལ་བྱའི་དོན་ལ་ཚད་མས་མི་གནོད་པ་གཅིག་དགོས་པ་འདི་དེ་ལ་བྱེད་པའི་ཕྱིར། [ཀུན་རྟོབ་ཏུ་གྲུབ་པ་དང་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་གྲུབ་པ་ཞེས་པའི་ཀུན་རྟོབ་དང་ཐ་སྙད་ལ་རང་གི་གཞལ་བྱའི་དོན་ལ་ཚད་མས་མི་གནོད་པ་གཅིག་དགོས་པ་འདི་དེ་ལ་བྱེད་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། འདིའི་ཀུན་རྟོབ་བདེན་འཛིན་གྱི་ཀུན་རྟོབ་མ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། ལང་གཤེགས་ལས། དངོས་རྣམས་སྐྱེ་བ་ཀུན་རྟོབ་ཏུ། །ཞེས་པ་དང་། དེའི་དོན་བཤད་པར། དབུ་མ་སྣང་བ་ལས། དེའི་ཕྱིར་དེ་དག་གི་བསམ་པའི་དབང་གིས་དངོས་པོ་རྫུན་པའི་ངོ་བོ་ཐམས་ཅད་ནི་ཀུན་རྟོབ་ཏུ་ཡོད་པ་ཁོ་ནའོ། །ཞེས་པ་དང་། རྣམ་བཤད་ལས། སྒྲོག་ཚགས་དེ་དག་གི་བསམ་པ་ནི་རྟོག་པ་ཁོ་ན་མ་ཡིན་གྱི་རྟོག་མེད་ཀྱི་ཤེས་པ་ལ་ཡང་བྱ་སྟེ། དེ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་དབང་གིས་ཡོད་པར་བཞག་ཞེས་པ་ནས། [པའི་དོན་དམ་བར་ཡོད་པ་མིན་པའི་དངོས་པོ་བརྫུན་པ་རྣམས་ཀུན་རྟོབ་ཁོ་ནར་ཡོད་པ་ནི། དངོས་རྣམས་སྐྱེ་བ་ཀུན་རྟོབ་ཏུ། ཞེས་པའི་དོན་ཏེ། དེ་ཡང་བདེན་འཛིན་གྱི་ཀུན་རྟོབ་ཏུ་ཡོད་པའི་] དོན་མ་[266]ཡིན་ནོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The third [part of the reason which is that **an awareness (1) apprehending phenomena as being established in that way—that is, as being established as their own mode of abiding without being only posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness—and (2) not polluted by tenets** is an innate conceptual consciousness apprehending true existence] is established because since [an awareness] mistaken that way [that is, apprehending phenomena as established as their own mode of abiding without being only posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness] has arisen from beginningless time, it is innate, and since apprehending true existence is not feasible in a sense consciousness, it must be a conceptual consciousness.

That [(an awareness) mistaken that way (that is, apprehending phenomena as established as their own mode of abiding without being only

posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness) has arisen from beginningless time, it is innate, and since apprehending true existence is not feasible in a sense consciousness, it must be a conceptual consciousness] follows because if apprehension of true existence existed in sense consciousnesses, there would have to be a common locus of sense consciousness and obstruction, whereas the means binding [beings] in cyclic existence is not suitable in a sense consciousness according to Khaydrub's *Compilation on Emptiness*, because:

the *Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra* (see above, 82) says:[a]

> That [consciousness] mistaken with regard to the lack of inherent existence
> [Is asserted as the obscurer of reality (*yang dag kun rdzob, satyaṃ saṃvṛti*).]

and regarding its time of mistake and mode of mistake Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle* (see above, 82) also says:

> Moreover, that [obscurer] arises through the power of thorough maturation of beginningless predispositions for mistake, and it sees things displayed as if they had an inherent nature in reality.[b]

and Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation [of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'"]* (see above, 85) says:

> The passage "Moreover, that [obscurer (*saṃvṛti*)] arises through the power of thorough maturation of beginningless predispositions for mistake" indicates that this apprehension of true existence is innate.

and so forth.

གསུམ་པ་[བློ་གནོད་མེད་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་མ་ཡིན་པར་རང་གི་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་དེ་ལྟར་གྲུབ་པར་འཛིན་ཅིང་གྲུབ་མཐས་མ་བསླད་པའི་བློ་ནི་བདེན་འཛིན་གྱི་རྟོག་པ་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་]གྲུབ་སྟེ། དེ་ལྟར་འཁྲུལ་པ་ཐོག་མེད་ཀྱི་དུས་[195b]ནས་བྱུང་བས་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཡིན་ལ་དབང་ཤེས་ལ་བདེན་འཛིན་མི་འཐད་པས་རྟོག་པ་ཡིན་དགོས་པའི་ཕྱིར། [བློ་གནོད་མེད་ལ་སྣང་

[a] Jam-yang-shay-pa cites only the first line; the second is added for the sake of context.

[b] Alternative translation: Due to that [obscurer, all living beings] see [things] displayed as if they had an inherent nature in reality.

བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་མ་ཡིན་པར་རང་གི་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་གྲུབ་པ་དེ་ལྟར་འཁྲུལ་པ་ཐོག་མེད་ཀྱི་དུས་ནས་བྱུང་བས་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་ཡིན་ལ་དབང་ཤེས་ལ་བདེན་འཛིན་མི་འཐད་པས་རྟོག་པ་ཡིན་དགོས་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། དབང་ཤེས་ལ་བདེན་འཛིན་ཡོད་ན་དབང་ཤེས་དང་སྒྲིབ་པའི་གཞི་མཐུན་ཡོད་དགོས་པས་འཁོར་བར་འཆིང་བྱེད་དབང་ཤེས་ལ་མི་རུང་བར་སྟོང་ཐུན་ལྟར་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། ལང་གཤེགས་ལས། རང་བཞིན་མེད་ལ་འཁྲུལ་པ་གང་། །ཞེས་དང་། དེའི་འཁྲུལ་བའི་དུས་དང་འཁྲུལ་ཚུལ་ཡང་དབུ་མ་སྣང་བ་ལས། དེ་ཡང་ཐོག་མ་མེད་པའི་འཁྲུལ་བའི་བག་ཆགས་ཡོངས་སུ་སྨིན་པའི་དབང་གིས་བྱུང་ལ། དེས་ཀུན་སྲོག་ཆགས་ཐམས་ཅད་ལ་ཡང་དག་པའི་དངོས་པོའི་བདག་ཉིད་ལྟ་བུར་ཉེ་བར་བསྟན་པ་མཐོང་བར་འགྱུར་ཏེ། ཞེས་དང་། རྣམ་བཤད་ལས། དེ་ཡང་ནས་བྱུང་བའི་བར་གྱིས་བདེན་འཛིན་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་སུ་སྟོན་ཏོ[a]། །ཞེས་སོགས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

For, the *Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra* (see above, 82) says:[b]

> [That (consciousness) mistaken with regard to the lack of inherent existence]
> Is asserted as the obscurer of reality (*yang dag kun rdzob*, *satyaṃ saṃvṛti*).

and regarding its meaning Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle* (see above, 82) says:

> A mistaken awareness that superimposes—on things that in reality [or ultimately] are natureless—an aspect opposite to that [naturelessness] is called an "obscurer" (*kun rdzob, saṃvṛti*) because it obstructs [itself] from [perception of] suchness or because it veils

---

[a] This was cited earlier (see above, 85) slightly differently as:
དེ་ཡང་ནས་བྱུང་བའི་བར་གྱིས་ནི་བདེན་འཛིན་དེ་ལྷན་སྐྱེས་སུ་སྟོན་ཏོ། །

[b] Jam-yang-shay-pa cites only the first line; the second is added for the sake of context.

[other awarenesses] from perception of suchness.

and Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation [of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'"]* (see above, 84) says:

> The passage "A mistaken awareness that superimposes—on things that in reality [or ultimately] are natureless—an aspect opposite to that [naturelessness]" refers to [a consciousness] mistaking what does not ultimately exist inherently to exist ultimately.
>
> The passage "…is called an 'obscurer' (*kun rdzob, saṃvṛti*) because it obstructs [itself] from [perception of] suchness or because it veils [other awarenesses] from perception of suchness" is the meaning of "the obscurer of reality (*yang dag kun rdzob*, *satyaṃ saṃvṛti*)" [in the quote from the *Descent into Laṅkā Sūtra*]. *Saṃvṛti* [here] is taken as [meaning] "obstructor" (*sgrib byed*), obstructing reality.

ལང་གཤེགས་ལས། དེ་ནི་ཡང་དག་ཀུན་རྫོབ་འདོད། །ཅེས་དང་། དེའི་དོན། དབུ་མ་སྣང་བ་ལས། དངོས་པོ་ཡང་དག་པར་ངོ་བོ་ཉིད་མེད་པ་དག་ལ་ཡང་དེ་ལས་བཟློག་པའི་རྣམ་པར་སྒྲོ་འདོགས་པའི་འཁྲུལ་བའི་བློ་གང་ཡིན་པ་དེ་ནི་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཅེས་བྱ་སྟེ་འདིའམ་འདིས་དེ་ཁོ་ན་ཉིད་སྒྲིབ་པ་ལྟ་བུར་བྱེད་འགེབས་པ་ལྟ་བུར་བྱེད་པའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །ཞེས་དང་། རྣམ་བཤད་ལས། དེ་ནི་ཞེས་པ་ཡན་ཆད་ཅེས་པ་ནས། [ནི་དོན་དམ་པར་རང་བཞིན་མེད་པ་ལ་དོན་དམ་པར་ཡོད་པར་འཁྲུལ་པའི་དོན་ནོ། །ཀུན་རྫོབ་ནས་ཕྱིར་རོའི་བར་ནི་ཡང་དག་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཅེས་པའི་དོན་ཏེ། ཀུན་རྫོབ་སྒྲིབ་བྱེད་ལ་བྱས་ནས་ཡང་དག་པ་ལ་]སྒྲིབ་པར་བྱེད་པའོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The remainder has already been explained.

ལྷག་མ་བཤད་ཟིན་ཏོ།

On this occasion, there is a way of applying the example of a magician's illusion to [the meaning] because when a magical illusion is emanated:

- those whose eyes have been affected [by the mantra the magician has cast] and sentient beings who have not realized emptiness are similar
- likewise, the magician and persons who have realized the view [of emptiness] are similar
- and those whose eyes have not been affected and Bodhisattva Superiors in meditative equipoise are similar.

སྐབས་འདིར་སྒྱུ་མའི་དཔེ་དང་སྦྱོར་ཚུལ་ཡོད་དེ། སྒྱུ་མ་སྤྲུལ་བའི་[196a]ཚེ་མིག་བསླད་པ་དང་སྟོང་ཉིད་མ་རྟོགས་པའི་སེམས་ཅན་མཚུངས། དེ་བཞིན་དུ་སྒྱུ་མ་མཁན་དང་ལྟ་བ་རྟོགས་པའི་གང་ཟག་དང་། མིག་མ་བསླད་པ་དང་བྱང་འཕགས་མཉམ་བཞག་པ་མཚུངས་པ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The first [those whose eyes have been affected by the mantra the magician has cast and sentient beings who have not realized emptiness] are similar because:

1. those whose eyes have been affected [by the mantra the magician has cast] do not accept that a magic horse or elephant appears due to a mistaken awareness but apprehend [the basis of conjuring (*sprul gzhi*) such as a pebble or twig] as an objective horse or elephant
2. and the dawning—to those who have not realized emptiness—of all phenomena in the manner of an objective mode of abiding without dawning as posited through appearing to an awareness

are similar.

དང་པོ་[མིག་བསླད་པ་དང་སྟོང་ཉིད་མ་རྟོགས་པའི་སེམས་ཅན་]མཚུངས་ཏེ། མིག་བསླད་པས་སྒྱུ་མའི་རྟ་གླང་བློ་འཁྲུལ་པས་སྣང་བར་མི་འདོད་པར་དོན་གྱི་རྟ་གླང་དུ་འཛིན་པ་ལྟར་སྟོང་ཉིད་མ་རྟོགས་པ་ལ་ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་བློ་ལ་སྣང་བས་བཞག་པར་མི་འཆར་བར་དོན་གྱི་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་འཆར་བ་མཚུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The second [the magician and persons who have realized the view of emptiness] are similar because just as, in the example [of an illusory horse or elephant], although that [basis of conjuring] appears to that [magician] as

that [horse or elephant, the magician] thinks it is due to [his] awareness, those who have realized the view also realize that appearances [of all phenomena] that way [that is, as established in an objective mode of abiding without being posited through appearing to an awareness] are nothing more than only posited through the force of mistaken[a] awareness.

གཉིས་པ་[སྒྱུ་མ་མཁན་དང་ལྟ་བ་རྟོགས་པའི་གང་ཟག་]མཚུངས་ཏེ། དཔེ་[སྒྱུ་མའི་རྟ་གླང་། སྒྱུ་མ་མཁན་]དེས་[རྟ་གླང་]དེར་སྣང་ཡང་བློའི་དབང་[266]གིས་ཡིན་སྙམ་པ་ལྟར་ལྟ་བ་རྟོགས་པས་ཀྱང་[ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་བློ་ལ་སྣང་བས་མ་བཞག་པར་དོན་གྱི་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་གྲུབ་པ་]དེར་སྣང་བ་བློ་~~མ~~་འཁྲུལ་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་ལས་མེད་པར་རྟོགས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The third [that is, those whose eyes are not polluted and Bodhisattva Superiors in meditative equipoise] are established [as similar] because just as, in the example, [those whose eyes are not affected by the mantra] do not have any appearance or conception [of a horse or elephant], in what is exemplified both the appearance of true existence and conception of true existence do not exist in the perspective of meditative equipoise of those [Bodhisattva Superiors].

གསུམ་པ་[མིག་མ་བསླད་པ་དང་བྱང་འཕགས་མཉམ་བཞག་པ་མཚུངས་པར་]གྲུབ་སྟེ། དཔེ་[མིག་མ་བསླད་པ་]ལ་[རྟ་གླང་གི་]སྣང་ཞེན་གང་ཡང་མེད་པ་ལྟར་དོན་[བྱང་འཕགས་]དེའི་མཉམ་བཞག་གི་ངོར་བདེན་སྣང་དང་བདེན་ཞེན་གཉིས་ཀ་མེད་པའི་ཕྱིར།

---

[a] Correcting "**un**mistaken" (***ma*** *'khrul ba*) in the 2011 TBRC *bla brang* (196a.3) to "mistaken" (*'khrul ba*) in accordance with parallelism with the example in which the magician knows that the appearance of a horse or elephant is due to his mantra that has affected even his own eye consciousness and made it mistaken. As Tsong-kha-pa says in the passage cited above (90): (emphasis mine)

> Therefore, that the basis of conjuring can be posited as appearing as a horse or elephant is, according to the magician, through the force of appearing that way to a *mistaken awareness;* it is not posited otherwise through the force of the mode of abiding of the basis of conjuring itself.

There are means of comprehending appearances of magic horses and elephants because:

- according to Yogic Middle Way Proponents (*rnal 'byor spyod pa'i dbu ma pa, yogācara-mādhyamika*), since magic horses and elephants are appearance-factors of the mind, they are implicitly realized by self-cognitions comprehending them, whereby [appearances of magic horses and elephants] are established [that is, certified] by self-cognizing direct perceptions
- according to Sūtra Middle Way Proponents (*mdo sde spyod pa'i dbu ma pa, sautrāntika-mādhyamika*), since magic horses and elephants are external objects and imputed form sense-spheres, [appearances of magic horses and elephants] are established [that is, certified] by sense direct perceptions apprehending either the area [on which the illusion appears] or intermediate space [in which it appears].

སྒྱུ་མའི་རྟ་གླང་གི་སྣང་བ་འཇལ་བྱེད་ཡོད་དེ། རྣལ་འབྱོར་སྤྱོད་པའི་དབུ་མ་པ་ལྟར་ན་དེའི་རྟ་གླང་སེམས་ཀྱི་སྣང་ཆ་ཡིན་པས་སེམས་དེ་འཇལ་བའི་རང་རིག་གིས་ཤུགས་ལ་རྟོགས་པས་རང་རིག་མངོན་སུམ་དང་། མདོ་སྡེ་སྤྱོད་པའི་དབུ་མ་པ་ལྟར་ན་དེའི་རྟ་གླང་ཕྱི་དོན་དང་ཀུན་བཏགས་པའི་གཟུགས་ཀྱི་སྐྱེ་མཆེད་ཡིན་པས་ས་ཕྱོགས་དང་བར་སྣང་ཅེ་རིགས་འཛིན་པའི་དབང་མངོན་གྱིས་འགྲུབ་པའི་ཕྱིར།

Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation [of Chandrakīrti's Entry to (Nāgārjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle"]* (see above, 92) says:

> According to the Yogic Middle Way [Autonomists, who do not assert external objects], the appearance of such an illusion is established [that is, certified] by a self-knowing direct perception, and according to [Sūtra Middle Way Autonomists], who assert external objects, the appearance of such an illusion is established [that is, certified] by a sense direct perception apprehending the basis—for instance, the area [on which the illusion appears] or intermediate space [in which it appears].

This will be explained below.

རྣམ་བཤད་ལས། དེ་ལྟར་སྒྱུ་མའི་སྣང་བ་ནི། ནས། [རྣལ་འབྱོར་སྤྱོད་པའི་དབུ་མ་པ་ལྟར་ན་རང་རིག་མངོན་སུམ་དང་། ཕྱི་རོལ་ཁས་ལེན་པའི་རང་རྒྱུད་པ་ལྟར་ན་ས་ཕྱོགས་སམ་བར་སྣང་ལྟ་བུའི་གཞི་འཛིན་པའི་དབང་པོའི་མངོན་སུམ་གྱིས་]འགྲུབ་ལ་ཞེས་སོ། །འདི་འོག་[196b]ཏུ་འཆད་པར་འགྱུར་རོ།

3) DISPELLING OBJECTIONS [TO OUR OWN SYSTEM]

གསུམ་པ་[རྩོད་སྤོང་]ལ་

17. ***Someone says:*** It follows that the subjects, the horns of a rabbit, exist because of being established in conventional terms and conventionally. It follows [that the subject, the horns of a rabbit, are established in conventional terms and conventionally established] because of being established as only posited through the force of an awareness.

ཁོ་ན་རེ། རི་བོང་རྭ་ཆོས་ཅན། ཡོད་པར་ཐལ། ཐ་སྙད་དུ་དང་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་གྲུབ་པའི་ཕྱིར། [རི་བོང་རྭ་ཆོས་ཅན་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་དང་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་གྲུབ་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། བློ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་དུ་གྲུབ་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: [Whatever is established as only posited through the force of an awareness is] not necessarily [established in conventional terms and conventionally established].

[བློ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་དུ་གྲུབ་ན་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་དང་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་གྲུབ་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ།

18. With regard to that, someone says: Well then, it follows that all phenomena are only posited through the force of an awareness because [whatever is established as only posited through the force of an awareness] is not necessarily [established in conventional terms and conventionally established]. If you accept [that all phenomena are only posited through the force of an awareness], it follows that [all phenomena] are not established

from their own side because you accept [that all phenomena are only posited through the force of an awareness].

བྱས་པ་ལ་ཁོ་ན་རེ། འོ་ན། ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། [བློ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་དུ་གྲུབ་ན་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་དང་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་གྲུབ་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ་པ་དེའི་ཕྱིར། [ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡིན་པར་]འདོད་ན། [ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་]རང་ངོས་ནས་མ་གྲུབ་པར་ཐལ། [ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡིན་པར་]འདོད་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: [That all phenomena are only posited through the force of an awareness] does not entail [that all phenomena are not established from their own side] because although these [Autonomists] do not accept that [all phenomena] are established from their own side without being posited through the force of an awareness, being posited in that way—[that is, only posited through the force of an awareness]—does not contradict being established by way of their own character.

[ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡིན་ན་ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་རང་ངོས་ནས་མ་གྲུབ་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ་སྟེ། [རང་རྒྱུད་པ་]འདི་པས་བློའི་དབང་གིས་མ་བཞག་པའི་རང་ངོས་ནས་གྲུབ་པ་མི་འདོད་ཀྱང་དེ་ལྟར་བཞག་པ་དང་རང་མཚན་གྱིས་གྲུབ་པ་མི་འགལ་བའི་ཕྱིར།

19. With regard to this, someone says: The subjects, all phenomena, are only posited through the force of appearing to a conceptual consciousness because that both conceptual and non-conceptual consciousnesses exist in the "awareness" in "[through the force] of appearing to an awareness" is the meaning of "through the power of those [living beings'] mentations." If you accept [that all phenomena are only posited through the force of appearing to a conceptual consciousness], it follows [that all phenomena are only imputed by a conceptual consciousness] because of being only posited through the force of appearing to a conceptual consciousness.

བྱས་པ་ལ་ཁོ་ན་རེ། ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་ཆོས་ཅན། རྟོག་པ་ལ་སྣང་

བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། བློ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་ཞེས་པའི་བློ་ལ་རྟོག་པ་དང་རྟོག་མེད་གཉིས་ཡོད་པ་ནི་དེ་དག་གི་བསམ་པའི་དབང་གིས་ཞེས་པའི་དོན་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར། [ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་རྟོག་པ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡིན་པར་]འདོད་ན། [ཆོས་ཐམས་ཅད་ཆོས་ཅན།]རྟོག་པས་བཏགས་ཙམ་ཡིན་པར་ཐལ། རྟོག་པ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: [Being only posited through the force of appearing to a conceptual consciousness] does not entail [being only imputed by a conceptual consciousness] because the meaning of those two [being only posited through the force of appearing to a conceptual consciousness and being only imputed by a conceptual consciousness] are different. It follows [that the meaning of those two, being only posited through the force of appearing to a conceptual consciousness and being only imputed by a conceptual consciousness, are different] because an object posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective conceptual consciousness requires that the object exist in the mode of abiding in accordance with how it is apprehended by that [non-defective conceptual consciousness], but due to the phrase "only imputed by a conceptual consciousness" [an object only imputed by a conceptual consciousness] requires [an object] not in accordance with the mode of abiding superimposed by this [conceptual consciousness].

[རྟོག་པ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡིན་ན་རྟོག་པས་བཏགས་ཙམ་ཡིན་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ་སྟེ། [རྟོག་པ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡིན་པ་དང་རྟོག་པས་བཏགས་ཙམ་ཡིན་པ་]དེ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་དོན་མི་འདྲ་བའི་ཕྱིར། [རྟོག་པ་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡིན་པ་དང་རྟོག་པས་བཏགས་ཙམ་ཡིན་པ་]དེ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་དོན་མི་འདྲ་བ་]དེར་ཐལ། རྟོག་པ་གནོད་མེད་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པའི་དོན་ནི་[རྟོག་པ་གནོད་མེད་]དེས་བཟུང་བ་ལྟར་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་སོང་བའི་དོན་གཅིག་དགོས་ལ། རྟོག་པས་

བཏགས་ཙམ་ཞེས་པས་[རྟོག་པ་]དེས་སྒྲོ་བཏགས་པའི་སྡོད་ལུགས་ལྟར་མིན་པ་གཅིག་དགོས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

It follows [that an object posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective conceptual consciousness requires that the object exist in the mode of abiding in accordance with how it is apprehended by that (non-defective conceptual consciousness), but due to the phrase "only imputed by a conceptual consciousness" (an object only imputed by a conceptual consciousness) requires (an object) not in accordance with the mode of abiding superimposed by this (conceptual consciousness)] because the meanings of "Through the force of an awareness or a conceptual consciousness" and "Through the force of appearing to them" are similar, because Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation [of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'"]* says:[a]

> Since this is the case, [in the Autonomy School] "to exist in the manner of an objective mode of abiding without being posited through appearing to an awareness, or through the force of an awareness"[b]

[རྟོག་པ་གནོད་མེད་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པའི་དོན་ནི་(རྟོག་པ་གནོད་མེད་)དེས་བཟུང་བ་ལྟར་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་སོང་བའི་དོན་གཅིག་དགོས་ལ། རྟོག་པས་བཏགས་ཙམ་ཞེས་པས་(རྟོག་པ་)དེས་སྒྲོ་བཏགས་པའི་སྡོད་ལུགས་ལྟར་མིན་པ་གཅིག་དགོས་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། བློའམ་རྟོག་པའི་དབང་གིས་ཞེས་པ་[268]དང་། དེ་དག་གི་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་ཞེས་པ་དོན་འདྲ་བའི་ཕྱིར། རྣམ་བཤད་ལས། དེ་ལྟར་བྱས་ན་བློ་[197a]ལ་སྣང་བའམ་བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་མ་ཡིན་པར་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་ཡོད་པ། ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

[a] Hopkins, *Tsong-kha-pa's Final Exposition of Wisdom,* 192; Tibetan: Tsong-kha-pa, *dbu ma dgongs pa rab gsal,* 131.

[b] Tsong-kha-pa finishes the sentence with, "is to truly exist, to ultimately exist, and to exist as [the object's own] reality, and apprehending such is an innate apprehension of true existence."

20. Also, someone says: It follows that even the Proponents of True Existence realize that the two, specifically characterized and generally characterized phenomena such as forms and so forth, are conventionally established because those [Proponents of True Existence] know to posit the two objects of comprehension[a] through the force of the two valid cognitions [direct perception and inference], and the two valid cognitions are non-defective awarenesses.

ཡང་ཁོ་ན་རེ། དངོས་སྨྲ་བས་ཀྱང་གཟུགས་སོགས་རང་སྤྱི་གཉིས་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་གྲུབ་པར་རྟོགས་པར་ཐལ། [དངོས་སྨྲ་བ་]དེ་དག་གིས་ཚད་མ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་དབང་གིས་གཞལ་བྱ་གཉིས་འཇོག་ཤེས་པ་གང་ཞིག ཚད་མ་གཉིས་བློ་གནོད་མེད་ཡིན་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: [That those (Proponents of True Existence) know to posit the two objects of comprehension through the force of the two valid cognitions, and that the two valid cognitions are non-defective awarenesses] does not entail [that even the Proponents of the True Existence realize that the two, specifically characterized and generally characterized phenomena such as forms and so forth, are conventionally established]:

- because the meanings understood by these two [(1) posited through the force of appearing to a non-defective awareness and (2) posited through the force of valid cognition] are utterly different,
- because these [Proponents of True Existence] accept that [forms and so forth] appearance to a non-defective awareness itself as the mode of abiding of those objects and accept (1) that there is nothing more than [forms and so forth] being posited over there through the force of appearing [to a non-defective awareness] and (2) that the comprehension of the mode of abiding of objects of comprehension by the two valid cognitions is the positing of objects of comprehension,
- because Tsong-kha-pa's *Explanation of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'"* (see above, 91) says:[b]

> When a basis [that is, an object] appears in a certain way, there are two [types]—those that do and do not correspond with the

[a] The two types of objects of comprehension are specifically and generally characterized objects, or impermanent and permanent objects, or manifest and hidden objects.

[b] Adapted from Hopkins, *Tsong-kha-pa's Final Exposition of Wisdom,* 196; Tibetan: Tsong-kha-pa, *dbu ma dgongs pa rab gsal,* 133.

mode of subsistence in accordance with how it appears. When you differentiate well this [presentation of how phenomena are posited through the force of awarenesses according to the Autonomy School], you will come to differentiate the two positions [of the Autonomy School and the Proponents of True Existence which some] confuse. They think:

> Objects of comprehension [that is, all objects] are posited through the force of valid cognitions, and since valid cognitions are awarenesses, the positing of objects of comprehension through them is a case of positing [objects] through the force of an awareness. Hence, even the systems of the Proponents of True Existence refute true establishment.

[However,] that objects of comprehension are posited [that is, certified] through the force of valid cognitions means that valid cognitions realize the mode of abiding of the two [types of] objects of comprehension.

[(དངོས་སྨྲ་བ་)དེ་དག་གིས་ཚད་མ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་དབང་གིས་གཞལ་བྱ་གཉིས་འཇོག་ཤེས་པ་གང་ཞིག ཚད་མ་གཉིས་བློ་གནོད་མེད་ཡིན་ན་དངོས་སྨྲ་བས་ཀྱང་གཟུགས་སོགས་རང་སྤྱི་གཉིས་ཀུན་རྫོབ་ཏུ་གྲུབ་པར་རྟོགས་པས་]མ་ཁྱབ་སྟེ། [བློ་གནོད་མེད་ལ་སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་དང་ཚད་མའི་དབང་གིས་གཞལ་བྱ་འཇོག་པ་]དེ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་གོ་དོན་གཏན་ནས་མི་འདྲ་བའི་ཕྱིར། [དངོས་སྨྲ་བ་]འདི་བས་བློ་གནོད་མེད་ལ་སྣང་བ་དེ་ཀ་ཡུལ་དེའི་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་འདོད་ལ། སྣང་བའི་དབང་གིས་ཕར་བཞག་པ་ལས་མེད་ལ། ཚད་མ་གཉིས་ཀྱིས་གཞལ་བྱའི་སྡོད་ལུགས་གཞལ་བ་ལ་གཞལ་བྱ་བཞག་པར་འདོད་པའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །རྣམ་བཤད་ལས། གཞི་དེར་སྣང་བ་དེ་ཤར་བ་ན་སྣང་བ་ལྟར་གྱི་སྡོད་ལུགས་སུ་འགྲོ་བ་དང་མི་འགྲོ་བ་གཉིས་ཡོད་དེ། དེ་ལེགས་པར་ཕྱེད་ན། ཞེས་པ་ནས། [ཚད་མའི་དབང་གིས་གཞལ་བྱ་འཇོག་པ་ལ། ཚད་མ་ཡང་བློ་ཡིན་པས་དེས་གཞལ་བྱ་འཇོག

པ་ཡང་བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པར་འགྱུར་བས། དངོས་པོར་སྨྲ་བ་རྣམས་ཀྱི་ལུགས་ཀྱིས་ཀྱང་བདེན་གྲུབ་ཁེགས་པར་འགྱུར་རོ་སྙམ་དུ། ཕྱོགས་དེ་གཉིས་འདྲེས་པ་ཕྱེད་པར་འགྱུར་ཏེ། ཚད་མའི་དབང་གིས་གཞལ་བྱ་འཇོག་པ་ནི་གཞལ་བྱ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་སྡོད་ལུགས་ཚད་མས་རྟོགས་པའི་དོན་ཡིན་པས།] དེ་དང་ཐ་མ་གཉིས་གཏན་མི་འདྲ་བའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །ཞེས་སོ།

21. *Also, someone says:* It follows that the objects of negation in the two, the Autonomy School and the Consequence School, do not differ in coarseness and subtlety because (1) with regard to the nonexistence of inherent nature both [the Autonomy School and the Consequence School] assert in that way and (2) if something more subtle than that were negated, one would fall to an extreme of annihilation. The first [part of the reason, which is that with regard to the nonexistence of inherent nature both (the Autonomy School and the Consequence School) assert in that way] follows because Shāntarakṣhita's *Ornament for the Middle* and his *Autocommentary* say,[a] "inherent nature does not exist," and Kamalashīla's *Commentarial Explanation [of (Shāntarakṣhita's) "Ornament for the Middle"]* and his *Illumination of the Middle* and so forth very many times speak of "nonexistence of inherent nature."

ཡང་ཁོ་ན་རེ། ཐལ་རང་གཉིས་ཀྱི་དགག་བྱ་ལ་ཕྲ་རགས་མེད་པར་ཐལ། རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་[ཐལ་རང་]གཉིས་ཀས་དེ་ལྟར་འདོད་པ་གང་ཞིག དེ་ལས་ཕྲ་བ་བཀག་ན་ཆད་མཐར་ལྷུང་བའི་ཕྱིར། [རང་བཞིན་མེད་པར་ཐལ་རང་གཉིས་ཀས་དེ་ལྟར་འདོད་པ་]དང་པོ་དེར་ཐལ། དབུ་མ་རྒྱན་ལས། རང་བཞིན་མེད་དེ་ཞེས་པ་རྩ་འགྲེལ་དང་། [དབུ་མ་རྒྱན་]དེའི་འགྲེལ་བཤད་དང་དབུ་མ་སྣང་བ་སོགས་ལས་རང་བཞིན་མེད་ཅེས་བཤད་པ་ཤིན་ཏུ་མང་བའི་ཕྱིར་ན་

Our response: [The above citations] do not entail [that with regard to the nonexistence of inherent nature both the Autonomy School and the Consequence School assert in that way] because although you are right that

[a] Masamichi Ichigō *Madhyamakālaṁkāra of Śāntarakṣita: With His Own Commentary or Vṛtti and with the Subcommentary or Pañjikā of Kamalashīla,* 22-23

there are many in that way with respect to the words, in fact when analyzed well, there are distinctions of utter dissimilarity in mental perspective. It follows that [although you are right that there are many in that way with respect to the words, in fact when analyzed well, there are distinctions of utter dissimilarity in mental perspective] because (1) these [Autonomists] assert that forms and so forth are established as they appear to children and above, whereas (2) Consequentialists take establishment that way [that is, establishment in accordance with appearance] as an object of negation.

མ་ཁྱབ་སྟེ། ཚིག་ལ་དེ་འདྲ་མང་བ་ཁྱོད་བདེན་ཀྱང་དོན་ལ་ལེགས་[197b]པར་དཔྱད་ན་གཏན་ནས་བློ་ངོ་ན་མི་འདྲ་བའི་ཁྱད་པར་ཡོད་པའི་ཕྱིར། [ཚིག་ལ་དེ་འདྲ་མང་བ་ཁྱོད་བདེན་ཡང་དོན་ལ་ལེགས་པར་དཔྱད་ན་གཏན་ནས་བློ་ངོ་ན་མི་འདྲ་བའི་ཁྱད་པར་ཡོད་པ་]དེར་ཐལ། [རང་རྒྱུད་པ་]འདི་དག་གིས་བྱིས་པ་ཡན་ཆད་ལ་གཟུགས་སོགས་སྣང་བ་ལྟར་གྲུབ་པར་འདོད་ལ། ཐལ་འགྱུར་བས་དེ་ལྟར་གྲུབ་པ་དགག་བྱར་བྱེད་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The first [reason which is that these [Autonomists] assert that forms and so forth are established as they appear to children and above] is established because:

(1) Shāntarakṣhita's *Autocommentary of the Ornament for the Middle* says:[a]

> We do not negate inherent natures—coming to mind within sole non-examination—that are experienced ranging from the states of childish beings through to omniscient pristine wisdom.

(2) and Jñānagarbha's *Differentiation of the Two Truths* (22ab) says:[b]

> Make an explanation why
> From this cause that appears.

and Jñānagarbha's *Autocommentary [on the "Differentiation of*

[a] Ibid., 220.

[b] Malcolm David Eckel, *Jñānagarbha's Commentary on the Distinction between the Two Truths: An Eight Century Handbook of Madhyamaka Philosophy* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1987), 175.

the Two Truths"] on that says:

> Well, if [things] are only not ultimately produced at all, then why from this cause

and so forth, in answer to which his *Autocommentary* (22cd) says:[a]

> A response to this is returned:[b]
>
> > This such appears from this cause.
> > What [more] should be said!
>
> If as much as appears to you also appears to us, what is be asked about that! Even if asked, we would say just that. We would not say anything not experienced before.

(3) and also Jñānagarbha's *Differentiation of the Two Truths* (28) says:[c]

> That which is an entity of appearance
> Is just not to be negated.
> It is not at all logically feasible
> To negate whatever is experienced.

and Jñānagarbha's *Autocommentary [on the "Differentiation of the Two Truths"]* on that says:[d]

> The thinking is that "It would contradict direct perception."

(4) and [that Autonomists assert that forms and so forth are established as they appear to children and above] is known by Bhāvaviveka's refutation that imputationals [that is, imputational natures] are not established by way of their own character, and so forth.[e]

---

[a] Ibid., 175-176.

[b] For *lon* (2011 bla brang, 197b.4) Jñānagarbha's autocommentary, ibid., 175, reads *glon.*

[c] Ibid., 181.

[d] Ibid.

[e] As Hopkins says in *Where Is the Middle? Two Views of Reality in the Middle Way: The Autonomy and Consequence Schools,* Part Five: The Other Evidence (unpublished manuscript, 393):

> In Bhāvaviveka's refutation—in the twenty-fifth chapter of his *Lamp for (Nāgārjuna's) "Wisdom," Commentary on the "Treatise on the Middle"*—of the Mind-Only School's presentation of character-non-nature with regard to imputational natures, he states that if imputational natures are said to be character-non-natures, this would involve a deprecation of imputational natures. Here, "character-nature" is taken as meaning establishment by way of their own character; thus,

དང་པོ་[(རང་རྒྱུད་པ་)འདི་དག་གིས་བྱིས་པ་ཡན་ཆད་ལ་གཟུགས་སོགས་སྣང་བ་ལྟར་གྲུབ་པར་འདོད་པ་]གྲུབ་སྟེ། དབུ་མ་རྒྱན་རང་འགྲེལ་ལས། བྱིས་པའི་གནས་སྐབས་ནས་བཟུང་སྟེ། ཐམས་ཅད་མཁྱེན་པའི་ཡེ་ཤེས་ཀྱི་བར་དུ་མྱོང་བ་གང་མ་བརྟགས་གཅིག་པུ་ན་ཡིད་དུ་འོང་བའི་རང་བཞིན་ཁོ་བོས་བཀག་པ་མེད་དེ། ཞེས་དང་། བདེན་གཉིས་ལས། ཅི་ཡི་ཕྱིར་ན་རྒྱུ་འདི་ལས། །དེར་སྣང་བ་འདི་སྨྲ་བར་བྱོས། །ཞེས་དང་། དེའི་རང་འགྲེལ་ལས། འོ་ན་གལ་ཏེ་དོན་དམ་པར་ཅི་ཡང་མ་སྐྱེས་པ་ཁོ་ན་ཡིན་ན་དེའི་ཚེ་[269]ཅིའི་ཕྱིར་ན་རྒྱུ་འདི་ལས། ཞེས་སོགས་ཀྱི་ལན་དུ། རང་འགྲེལ་ལས། འདིའི་ལན་ལྡོན་པར་བྱེད་དེ། འདི་འདྲ་འདི་ནི་རྒྱུ་འདི་ལས། །སྣང་སྟེ་ཅི་ཞིག་སྨྲ་བར་བྱ། ཁྱོད་ལ་ཅི་ཙམ་སྣང་བ་དེ་ཙམ་ཁོ་བོ་ལ་ཡང་སྣང་ན་དེ་ལ་ཁོ་བོ་ཅག་ལ་ཅི་ཞིག་དྲི། དྲིས་ན་ཡང་ཁོ་བོས་དེ་ཙམ་ཁོ་ན་ཞིག་སྨྲ་བར་བྱའི་སྐྱོན་མ་མྱོང་བ་ནི་ཅི་ཡང་སྨྲ་བར་མི་བྱེད་དེ། ཞེས་དང་། ཡང་བདེན་གཉིས་ལས། སྣང་བའི་ངོ་བོ་གང་ཡིན་པ། །དེ་ནི་འགོག་པ་མ་ཡིན་ཉིད། །ཉམས་སུ་མྱོང་བ་གང་ཡང་ནི། །དགག་པར་རིགས་པ་མ་ཡིན་ནོ། །ཞེས་དང་། དེའི་རང་འགྲེལ་ལས། མངོན་སུམ་དང་འགལ་བར་འགྱུར་རོ་སྙམ་དུ་བསམ་པ་ཡིན་ནོ། །ཞེས་དང་། ལེགས་ལྡན་གྱིས་ཀུན་བཏགས་རང་[198a]མཚན་གྱིས་མ་གྲུབ་པ་བཀག་པ་སོགས་ཀྱིས་ཤེས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

The second reason [which is that Consequentialists take establishment that

Bhāvaviveka seems to be indicating that, for him, all phenomena—even existent imputational natures—are established by way of their own character. Tsong-kha-pa's *The Essence of Eloquence* addresses this point in detail in the chapter on the Autonomy School.

way (that is, establishment in accordance with appearance) as an object of negation] is established because of very many [reasons] such as the evidence for the nonexistence of commonly appearing subjects because:

Tsong-kha-pa's *The Essence of Eloquence* says:[a]

> Autonomists assert that the non-defective consciousnesses that posit [phenomena] as existing in conventional terms are non-mistaken with regard to an object established by way of its own character, the appearing object or the conceived object; however, in this [Consequentialist system] there are many [cases of consciousnesses] mistaken with respect to the appearing object that are able to posit objects. Therefore, these two [the Autonomists and the Consequentialists] differ greatly also with respect to whether consciousnesses are defective or not.

This is the thought of the statement in Chandrakīrti's *Commentary on (Āryadeva's) "Four Hundred Stanzas on the Yogic Deeds of Bodhisattvas,"*[b] "because a thing that abides in one aspect appears in another aspect."

གཉིས་པ་[ཐལ་འགྱུར་བས་དེ་ལྟར་གྲུབ་པ་དགག་བྱར་བྱེད་པ་]གྲུབ་སྟེ། ཆོས་ཅན་མཐུན་སྣང་བ་མེད་པའི་རྒྱུ་མཚན་སོགས་ཤིན་ཏུ་མང་བའི་ཕྱིར། ལེགས་བཤད་སྙིང་པོ་ལས། རང་རྒྱུད་པ་རྣམས་ཀྱིས་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་ཡོད་པར་འཇོག་པའི་ཤེས་པ་གནོད་མེད་ནི་སྣང་ཡུལ་ལམ་ཞེན་ཡུལ་རང་གི་མཚན་ཉིད་ཀྱིས་གྲུབ་པའི་དོན་ལ་མ་འཁྲུལ་བ་ཞིག་ལ་འདོད་ལ། འདི་ལ་སྣང་ཡུལ་ལ་འཁྲུལ་བས་དོན་འཇོག་

---

[a] From the chapter on the Consequence School in a section titled "How those reasonings refute establishment by way of [the object's] own character." Tibetan: Tsong kha pa blo bzang grags pa, *A Study of Tsong khapa's Mādhyamika Philosophy II: Annotated Japanese translation of the Mādhyamika Section of Essence of the Good Explanations (Legs bśad sñiṅ po, ツォンカパ中観哲学の研究 II),* tr. by Tsultrim Kelsang Khangkar and Katano Michio, assist. by Takada Yorihito (Kyoto, Japan: Bun-ei-do, 1998), 222.

[b] Candrakīrti, *byang chub sems dpa'i rnal 'byor spyod pa bzhi brgya pa'i rgya cher 'grel pa,* in *bstan 'gyur* (*sde dge*), TBRC W23703.103 (Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae Choedhey, Gyalwae Sungrab Partun Khang, 1982-1985), 197b.6-7; *bodhisattva-yogacaryā-catuḥśataka-ṭīkā.*

ནུས་པ་དུ་མ་ཞིག་ཡོད་པས་འདི་གཉིས་ཀྱི་ཤེས་པ་གནོད་པ་ཡོད་མེད་ཀྱང་ཁྱད་པར་ཆེ། ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར། འདི་ནི་བརྒྱ་པའི་འགྲེལ་པ་ལས། རྣམ་པ་གཞན་དུ་གནས་པའི་དངོས་པོ་ལ་རྣམ་པ་གཞན་དུ་སྣང་བའི་ཕྱིར་རོ། །ཞེས་པའི་དགོངས་པའོ། །

Therefore, it follows that although there are many similar phrases among the two, the Autonomists and the Consequentialists, the meaning of those [phrases] vary greatly in mental perspective because there are many cases where though the words are similar, the meanings differ such as “happily going along without analysis,” “without analysis, existent; but if analyzed, nonexistent,” “posited through the force of awareness,” “posited by names and terminology,” and so forth because:

Tsong-kha-pa’s *Explanation [of (Chandrakīrti’s) “Supplement to (Nāgārjuna’s) ‘Treatise on the Middle’”]* (see above, 98) says:[a]

> Hence, the objects of negation in the two Middle Way Schools come to differ greatly with regard to the perspective of the awareness [in the face of which objects are posited].[b]

and Tsong-kha-pa’s *The Essence of Eloquence* says:[c]

> Middle Way Autonomists are unable to posit forms, feelings, and so forth through the force of an awareness imputing conventions; rather, they assert that they are able to posit [forms, feelings, and so forth as] existent in conventional terms[d] through the force of appearing to non-defective sense consciousnesses and so forth. Hence, the awareness through the force of which [phenomena] are posited or are not posited also differs greatly [between the Conse-

---

[a] Tsong-kha-pa, *dbu ma dgongs pa rab gsal,* 136.

[b] For the Autonomists the awareness is any consciousness, either conceptual or non-conceptual, not affected by superficial causes of mistake, whereas for the Consequentialists it must be only conceptual since everything is only imputedly existent.

[c] From the chapter on the Consequence School in a section titled “Upon indicating the mode of apprehension by artificial and innate superimposition, showing that it does not exist.” Tibetan: Tsong kha pa blo bzang grags pa, *A Study of Tsong khapa’s Mādhyamika Philosophy II,* 94.

[d] Correcting *tha snyad* ***tu*** in 2011 TBRC bla brang (198a.6) to *tha snyad* ***du*** in accordance with euphonic rules.

quentialists and the Autonomists. Autonomists] assert that analysis of whether [something] exists or not and so forth through the force of the phenomenon's own mode of subsistence from its own side without being posited through the force of such an awareness comes from that [boundary] to be analysis of whether it is established as [its own] suchness or not; they do not assert that it is merely from the mode of analysis described earlier. Therefore, in conventional terms they assert establishment by way of [the object's] own character. Hence, they also differ [from the Consequentialists] with respect to what is eliminated by the term "only" in the statements in high sayings that conventionalities are name-only, only terminological, and only imputed.

དེས་ན་ཐལ་རང་གཉིས་ལ་ཚིག་འདྲ་བ་མང་ཡང་དེ་དག་གི་དོན་
ཡིད་ཙེ་ན་མི་འདྲ་བ་ཤིན་ཏུ་མང་བར་ཐལ། མ་བརྟགས་ཉམས་
དགའ་དང་མ་དཔྱད་ན་ཡོད་ལ་དཔྱད་ན་མེད་པ་དང་། བློའི་
དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་དང་མིང་བརྡས་བཞག་སོགས་ཚིག་འདྲ་
ཡང་དོན་མི་འདྲ་བ་དུ་མ་ཡོད་པའི་ཕྱིར། རྣམ་བཤད་ལས། དབུ་
མ་པ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་དགག་བྱ་ལ་བློ་ངོར་མི་འདྲ་བ་ཆེན་པོ་འོངས།
ཞེས་པ་དང་། ལེགས་བཤད་སྙིང་པོ་ལས། དབུ་མ་རང་རྒྱུད་པ་
རྣམས་ནི་ཐ་སྙད་འདོགས་པའི་བློའི་དབང་གིས་གཟུགས་ཚོར་
སོགས་འཇོག་མི་ནུས་ལ། དབང་པོའི་ཤེས་པ་སོགས་ལ་སྣང་བའི་
དབང་གིས་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་ཡོད་པ་འཇོག་ནུས་པར་འདོད་པས་བློའི་
དབང་གིས་བཞག་མ་བཞག་གི་བློ་[198b]ལ་ཡང་ཁྱད་པར་ཆེའོ།
ཞེས་པ་ནས། [། དེ་འདྲ་བའི་བློའི་དབང་གིས་བཞག་པ་མིན་པར་ཆོས་རང་གི་ངོས་
ཀྱི་གནས་ལུགས་ཀྱི་དབང་གིས་ཡོད་མེད་སོགས་དཔྱོད་པ་ནས་དེ་ཁོ་ནར་གྲུབ་མ་གྲུབ་
དཔྱོད་པར་འགྲོ་བར་འདོད་ཀྱི། སྔར་བཤད་པའི་དཔྱོད་ལུགས་དེ་ཙམ་ནས་མི་འདོད་
པས་ཐ་སྙད་དུ་རང་གི་མཚན་ཉིད་ཀྱིས་གྲུབ་པ་བཞེད་དོ། ། དེའི་ཕྱིར་གསུང་རབ་ལས་
ཀུན་རྫོབ་མིང་དང་བརྡ་དང་བཏགས་པ་ཙམ་དུ་གསུངས་པའི་]ཙམ་གྱི་སྒྲས་

[270]གང་གཅོད་ཀྱང་མི་མཐུན་ནོ། །ཞེས་གསུངས་པའི་ཕྱིར།

==***22. With regard to this, someone says:*** It follows that it is logically feasible that although [both Autonomists and Consequentialists say that phenomena] exist [as] only posited by names and terminology, Autonomists and Consequentialists differ with regard to what is eliminated by the term "only" because (1) that passage in Tsong-kha-pa's *The Essence of Eloquence* says this,[a] and (2) these [Autonomists assert that phenomena] exist [as] only posited [by names and terminology] within taking non-defective awareness as "terminology."

Our response: The way [that (1) that passage in Tsong-kha-pa's *The Essence of Eloquence* says this, and (2) these (Autonomists assert that phenomena) exist (as) only posited (by names and terminology) within taking non-defective awareness as "terminology"] does not entail [that it is logically feasible that although (both Autonomists and Consequentialists agree that phenomena) exist (as) only posited by names and terminology, Autonomists and Consequentialists differ with regard to what is eliminated by the term "only"] has already been explained earlier (see the response in the debate above on 124).

ཁྱེད་པ་ལ་ཁོ་ན་རེ། མིང་བརྡས་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡོད་ཀྱང་ཙམ་སྒྲས་གང་གཅོད་ཐལ་རང་མི་མཐུན་པའི་ཁྱད་པར་འཐད་པར་ཐལ། ལེགས་བཤད་སྙིང་པོའི་ལུང་དེ་གསུངས་པ་གང་ཞིག །འདི་བས་བློ་གནོད་མེད་ལ་བརྡར་བྱས་པའི་བཞག་ཙམ་ཡོད་པའི་ཕྱིར་ན་མ་ཁྱབ་ཚུལ་སྔར་བཤད་ཟིན་ཏོ། །

---

[a] That is, when Tsong-kha-pa, just above, says:

> Hence, they also differ [from the Consequentialists] with respect to what is eliminated by the term "only" in the statements in high sayings that conventionalities are name-only, only terminological, and only imputed.

Abbreviations

"1973 Ngawang Gelek *bla brang*" = *Collected Works of 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bźad-pa'i-rdo-rje,* vol. 15. New Delhi, India: Ngawang Gelek Demo, 1973. Also available at: TBRC W1KG9409.9.

"1997 Mundgod revision of Ngawang Gelek *bla brang*" = *Collected Works of 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bźad-pa'i-rdo-rje,* vol. 9. Mundgod, India: Gomang College, 1997. Also available at: TBRC W21503.9.

"2004 Beijing edition" = *dbu ma la 'jug pa'i mtha' dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang 'jug ngogs*. Beijing, China: pe cin yug hran shin 'gyig par khang, 2004.

"2007 Gomang edition" = *dbu ma la 'jug pa'i mtha' dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang 'jug ngogs*. Mundgod, Karnataka, India: Drepung Gomang Library, 2007.

"2011 TBRC *bla brang*" = *dbu ma la 'jug pa'i mtha' dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang 'jug ngogs*. TBRC W22186-I1KG10676: 1-442a.3, which is a PDF of: *bla brang bkra shis 'khyil,* a mdo.

"co ne" = *co ne bstan 'gyur.* TBRC W1GS66030. *co ne dgon chen: co ne,* 1926.

"Dharma" = the *sde dge* edition of the Tibetan canon published by Dharma Press: the *Nying-ma Edition of the sDe-dge bKa'-'gyur and bsTan-'gyur.* Oakland, Calif.: Dharma Press, 1980.

"Peking" = *Tibetan Tripiṭaka: Peking Edition kept in the Library of the Otani University, Kyoto*. Edited by Daisetz Teitarō Suzuki. Tokyo, Kyoto, Japan: Tibetan Tripiṭaka Research Foundation, 1955-1961.

"sde dge" = *sDe dge Tibetan Tripiṭaka—bsTan ḥgyur preserved at the Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo.* Edited by Z. Yamaguchi, et al. Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 1977-1984. The catalogue numbers are from *Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons.* Edited by Hukuji Ui. Sendai, Japan: Tohoku University, 1934. And *A Catalogue of the Tohuku University Collection of Tibetan Works on Buddhism.* Edited by Yensho Kanakura. Sendai, Japan: Tohoku University, 1953. TBRC W23703, which is a PDF of: Delhi: Karmapae Chodhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1977.

"TBRC" = Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center (http://www.tbrc.org).

Bibliography of Works Cited

1. Sūtras

Eight Thousand Stanza Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra
aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā
shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa brgyad stong pa
Peking 734, vol. 21; TBRC W22084
Sanskrit: P. L. Vaidya. *Aṣṭasāhasrika Prajñāpāramitā, with Haribhadra's Commentary called Ālokā*. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 4. Darbhanga, India: Mithila Institute, 1960.
English translation: Edward Conze. *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & Its Verse Summary*. Bolinas, Calif.: Four Seasons Foundation, 1973.

Five Hundred Stanza Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra
āryapañcaśatikāprajñāpāramitā
'phags pa shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa *lnga brgya pa*
Peking 0738, vol. 21.
English translation: Edward Conze. *The Short Prajñāpāramitā Texts*. London: Luzac, 1973.

One Hundred Fifty Modes of the Perfection of Wisdom
prajñāpāramitānayaśatapañcāśatikāsūtra
shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i tshul brgya lnga bcu pa'i mdo
Peking 121, vol. 5
English translation: Edward Conze. *The Short Prajñāpāramitā Texts,* 184-195. London: Luzac, 1973.

One Hundred Thousand Stanza Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra
śatasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā
shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag brgya pa
Peking 730, vols.12-18; Tohoku 8, vols. *ka-a* (*'bum*); TBRC W22084
Condensed English translation: Edward Conze. *The Large Sūtra on Perfect Wisdom*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

One Letter Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra
ekākṣarīmātānāmasarvatathāgataprajñāpāramitāsūtra
de bzhin gshegs pa thams cad kyi yum shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa yi ge gcig ma'i mdo
Peking 741, vol. 21; sde dge 23, Dharma vol. 12

Perfection of Wisdom in Few Letters
svalpākṣaraprajñāpāramitāsūtra
shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa yi ge nyung ngu
Peking 159, vol. 6
English translation: Edward Conze. *The Short Prajñāpāramitā Texts,* 144-147. London: Luzac, 1973.

Sūtra Unraveling the Thought
saṃdhinirmocanasūtra
dgongs pa nges par 'grel pa'i mdo
Peking 774, vol. 29; sde dge 106, vol. ca; Dharma, vol. 18
Tibetan text and French translation: Étienne Lamotte. *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra: L'Explication des mystères*. Louvain: Université de Louvain, 1935.
English translation: C. John Powers. *Wisdom of Buddha: Saṃdhinirmocana Sūtra*. Berkeley, Calif.: Dharma, 1995. Also: Thomas Cleary. *Buddhist Yoga: A Comprehensive Course*. Boston: Shambhala, 1995.

Twenty-five Thousand Stanza Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra

pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā
shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa stong phrag nyi shu lnga pa
Peking 731, vol. 19; TBRC W22084
English translation (abridged): Edward Conze. *The Large Sūtra on the Perfection of Wisdom.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975.

Verse Summary of the Perfection of Wisdom
prajñāpāramitāsañcayagāthā
shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa sdud pa tshigs su bcad pa
Peking 735, vol. 21; Tohoku 13, vol. *ka* (*shes rab sna tshogs*); TBRC W22084.34: 3-40
Sanskrit and Tibetan: Akira Yuyama. *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā (Sanskrit Recension A): Edited with an Introduction, Bibliographical Notes and a Tibetan Version from Tunhuang*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
Sanskrit: E. E. Obermiller. *Prajñāpāramitā-ratnaguṇa-sañcayagāthā*. Osnabrück, Germany: Biblio Verlag, 1970. Also: P. L. Vaidya. *Mahāyāna-sūtra-saṃgraha.* Part I. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, 17. Darbhanga, India: Mithila Institute, 1961.
English translation: Edward Conze. *The Perfection of Wisdom in Eight Thousand Lines & Its Verse Summary.* Bolinas, Calif.: Four Seasons Foundation, 1973.

2. Other Sanskrit and Tibetan Works

Buddhapālita (*sangs rgyas bskyangs,* ca. 470-540)
Buddhapālita Commentary on (Nāgārjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle"
buddhapālitamūlamadhyamakavṛtti
dbu ma rtsa ba'i 'grel pa bud+d+dha pA li ta
In *bstan 'gyur* (*sde dge*). TBRC W23703.96: 318-563, which is a PDF of: Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985.
Peking 5254, vol. 95; sde dge 3842, vol. *tsha;* Tokyo *sde dge* vol. 1
Edited Tibetan (Ch.1-12): Max Walleser. Bibliotheca Buddhica 16. Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970.
English translation of Ch.1: Judit Fehér. "Buddhapālita's *Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti*—Arrival and Spread of Prāsaṇgika-Mādhyamika Literature in Tibet." In *Tibetan and Buddhist Studies Commemorating the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of Alexander Csoma de Kūros*, vol. 1, edited by Louis Ligeti, 211-240. Budapest: Akadmiai Kiado, 1984.
Tibetan edition and English translation of Ch.18: Christian Lindtner. "Buddhapālita on Emptiness." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 23 (1981): 187-217.

Chandrakīrti (*zla ba grags pa,* seventh century)
Clear Words, Commentary on (Nāgārjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle"
mūlamadhyamakavṛttiprasannapadā
dbu ma rtsa ba'i 'grel pa tshig gsal ba
In *bstan 'gyur* (*sde dge*). TBRC W23703.102: 4-401, which is in a PDF of: Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985.
Sanskrit: Louis de La Vallée Poussin. *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā commentaire de Candrakīrti*. Bibliotheca Buddhica 4. Osnabrück, Germany: Biblio Verlag, 1970. Also, J.W. de Jong. "Text-critical Notes on the Prasannapadā." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 20, nos. 1/2 (1978): 25-59 and nos. 3/4 (1978): 217-252. Also, Sanskrit, Tibetan, and French translation of the *Madhyamakaśāstrastuti* that concludes *Clear Words:* J.W. de Jong. "La Madhyamakaśāstrastuti de Candrakīrti." *Oriens Extremus* 9 (1962): 47-56.
English translation (chaps. 1 and 25): T. Stcherbatsky. *Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa,* 77-222. Leningrad: Office of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1927; rev. reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1978.
English translation (chap. 2): Jeffrey Hopkins. "Analysis of Coming and Going." Dharmsala, India: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1974.

Partial English translation: Mervyn Sprung. *Lucid Exposition of the Middle Way: The Essential Chapters from the Prasannapadā of Candrakīrti translated from the Sanskrit*. London: Routledge, 1979; Boulder: Prajñā Press, 1979.

French translation (chaps. 2-4, 6-9, 11, 23, 24, 26, 28): Jacques May. *Prasannapadā Madhyamaka-vṛtti, douze chapitres traduits du sanscrit et du tibétain*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1959.

French translation (chaps. 18-22): J. W. de Jong. *Cinq chapitres de la Prasannapadā*. Paris: Geuthner, 1949.

French translation (chap. 17): É. Lamotte. "Le Traité de l'acte de Vasubandhu, Karmasiddhiprakaraṇa." *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 4 (1936): 265-288.

German translation (chaps. 5, 12-26): Stanislaw Schayer. *Ausgewählte Kapitel aus der Prasannapadā*. Krakow: Naktadem Polskiej Akademji Umiejetnosci, 1931.

German translation (chap. 10): Stanislaw Schayer. "Feuer und Brennstoff." *Rocznik Orjentalistyczny* 7 (1931): 26-52.

Commentary on (Āryadeva's) "Four Hundred"

bodhisattvayogācāracatuḥśatakaṭīkā

byang chub sems dpa'i rnal 'byor spyod pa bzhi brgya pa'i rgya cher 'grel pa

In *bstan 'gyur (sde dge)*. TBRC W23703.103: 62-479, which is a PDF of: Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae Choedhey, Gyalwae Sungrab Partun Khang, 1982-1985.

Peking 5266, vol. 98; sde dge 3865, vol. ya; Tokyo *sde dge* vol. 8

Edited Tibetan text and Sanskrit fragments and English translation: Karen Lang. *Āryadeva's Catuḥśataka: On the Bodhisattva's Cultivation of Merit and Knowledge*. Indiske Studier 7. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1986. Also: Karen Lang. *Four Illusions: Candrakīrti's Advice to Travelers on the Bodhisattva Path.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Edited Sanskrit fragments: Haraprasād Shāstri, "Catuḥśataka of Ārya Deva." Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, III no. 8 (1914), 449-514. Also (chaps. 8-16): Vidhusekhara Bhattacarya, ed. *The Catuḥśataka of Āryadeva: Sanskrit and Tibetan texts with copious extracts from the commentary of Candrakīrti*, Part II. Calcutta: Visva-Bharati Bookshop, 1931.

Edited Sanskrit fragments and Tibetan: *Sanskrit fragments and Tibetan translation of Candrakīrti's Bodhisattvayogacaryācatuḥśatakaṭīkā.* Tokyo: 1994.

Haribhadra (*seng ge bzang po,* eighth century)

Clear Meaning Commentary / Commentary on (Maitreya's) "Treatise of Quintessential Instructions on the Perfection of Wisdom: Ornament for the Clear Realizations"

spuṭhārtha / abhisamayālaṃkāranāmaprajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstravṛtti

'grel pa don gsal / shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i man ngag gi bstan bcos mngon par rtogs pa'i rgyan ces bya ba'i 'grel pa

Sanskrit editions:

Amano, Kōei. *A study on the Abhisamaya-alaṃkāra-kārikā-śāstra-vṛtti*. Rev. ed. Yanai City, Japan: Rokoku Bunko, 2008.

Tripathi, Ram Shankar. *Slob-dpon Seṅ-ge-bzaṅ-pos mdzad pa'i Mṅon-par-rtogs-pa'i-rgyan gyi 'grel pa Don-gsal (Prajñāpāramitopadeśaśāstre Ācāryaharibhadraviracitā Abhisamayālaṅkāravṛttiḥ Sphuṭārtha),* 1977. 2nd ed. Sarnath, India: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies. 1993.

Wogihara, Unrai. *Abhisamayālaṃkārālokā Prajñā-pāramitā-vyākhyā, The Work of Haribhadra.* 7 vols. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1932-1935; reprint, Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store, 1973.

Wogihara, Unrai, ed. *Abhisamayālaṃkārālokā Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā: Commentary on aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā by Haribhadra, Together with the Text Commented on*. Tokyo, Japan: The Toyo Bunko, 1973.

Tibetan edition: In *bstan 'gyur* (*sde dge*). TBRC W23703 86: 158-281, which is a PDF of: Delhi, India: Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985.

English translation: Sparham, Gareth. *Āryavimuktisena, Maitreyanātha, and Haribhadra. Abhisamayālaṃkāra with Vṛtti and Ālokā.* 4 vols. Fremont, CA: Jain Publishing Company,

2006-2011.

Jam-yang-shay-pa Ngag-wang-tson-drü (*'jam dbyangs bzhad pa'i rdo rje ngag dbang brtson grus,* 1648-1721/1722)

Great Exposition of Tenets / Explanation of "Tenets": Sun of the Land of Samantabhadra Brilliantly Illuminating All of Our Own and Others' Tenets and the Meaning of the Profound [Emptiness], Ocean of Scripture and Reasoning Fulfilling All Hopes of All Beings

grub mtha' chen mo / grub mtha'i rnam bshad rang gzhan grub mtha' kun dang zab don mchog tu gsal ba kun bzang zhing gi nyi ma lung rigs rgya mtsho skye dgu'i re ba kun skong

Tibetan editions:

Musoorie, India: Dalama, 1962.

Collected Works of 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bźad-pa'i-rdo-rje, vol. 14 (entire). New Delhi: Ngawang Gelek Demo, 1973.

Mundgod, India: Drepung Gomang Library, 1999.

English translation (entire root text and edited portions of the autocommentary and Nga-wang-pel-den's *Annotations*): Jeffrey Hopkins. *Maps of the Profound: Jam-yang-shay-ba's Great Exposition of Buddhist and Non-Buddhist Views on the Nature of Reality.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 2003.

English translation (beginning of the chapter on the Consequence School): Jeffrey Hopkins. *Meditation on Emptiness,* 581-697. London: Wisdom Publications, 1983; rev. ed., Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1996.

English translation of root text with Losang Gonchok's commentary: Daniel Cozort and Craig Preston. *Buddhist Philosophy: Losang Gonchok's Short Commentary to Jamyang Shayba's Root Text on Tenets*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 2003.

Translation of the section of the distinctive tenets of the Consequence School: Daniel Cozort, *Unique Tenets of the Middle Way Consequence School* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion, 1998).

Great Exposition of the Middle / Decisive Analysis of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'": Treasury of Scripture and Reasoning, Thoroughly Illuminating the Profound Meaning [of Emptiness], Entrance for the Fortunate

dbu ma chen mo / dbu ma 'jug pa'i mtha' dpyod lung rigs gter mdzod zab don kun gsal skal bzang 'jug ngogs

Tibetan editions:

Collected Works of 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bźad-pa'i-rdo-rje, vol. 9 (entire). New Delhi: Ngawang Gelek Demo, 1973. Also available at: TBRC W1KG9409.9.

Buxaduor, India: Gomang, 1967.

Collected Works of 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bźad-pa'i-rdo-rje, vol. 9. (entire). Mundgod, India: Gomang College, 1997. Also available at: TBRC W21503.9.

Beijing, China: pe cin yug hran shin 'gyig par khang, 2004.

Mundgod, Karnataka, India: Drepung Gomang Library, 2007.

In *kun mkhyen 'jam dbyangs bzhad pa'i rdo rje mchog gi gsung 'bum.* vol. 14. bla brang bkra shis 'khyil: bla brang brka shis 'khyil dgon, publishing date unknown. Also available at: TBRC W22186.14.

Translation of the section on the two truths: Guy M. Newland's Ph.D. thesis, *The Two truths: a study of Mādhyamika philosophy as presented in the Monastic textbooks of the Ge-luk-ba order of Tibetan Buddhism.*

Jñānagarbha (*ye shes snying po,* eighth century)

Differentiation of the Two Truths

satyadvayavibhaṅga*kārika*

bden pa gnyis rnam par 'byed pa'i tshig le'u byas pa

In *bstan 'gyur (sde dge)*. TBRC W23703.107: 4-8, which is in a PDF of: Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985.

Autocommentary of Differentiation of the Two Truths

bden gnyis rnam 'byed pa'i 'grel pa

sde dge 3881, vol. sa

In *bstan 'gyur* (*sde dge*). TBRC W23703.107: 8-32, which is in a PDF of: Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985.
English translation with critical edition: Eckel, Malcolm D. *Jñānagarbha's Commentary on the Distinction between the Two Truths: An Eighth Century Handbook of Madhyamaka Philosophy*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1987.

Kamalashīla (*pad ma'i ngang tshul;* ca. 740-795)
Illumination of the Middle
Madhyamakāloka
dbu ma snang ba
Peking 5287, vol. 101; sde dge 3887, vol. *sa*
In *bstan 'gyur (sde dge)*. TBRC W23703.107: 268-489, which is in a PDF of: Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985.

Shāntarakṣhita (*śāntarakṣita, zhi ba tsho,* ca. 725–788)
Commentary on the Difficult Points of (Jñānagarbha's) "Differentiation of the Two Truths"
satyadvayavibhaṅgapañjikā
bden pa gnyis rnam par 'byed pa'i dka' 'grel
In *bstan 'gyur (sde dge)*. TBRC W23703.107: 32-106, which is in a PDF of: Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985.
The Ornament of the Middle, Autocommentary, and Kamalashīla's Difficult Points of (Shāntarakṣhita's) "Ornament of the Middle"
madhyamakālaṃkārakārika, madhyamakālaṃkāravṛtti, and madhyamakālaṃkārapañjika
Ichigō, Masamichi. *Madhyamakālaṁkāra of Śāntarakṣita: With His Own Commentary or Vṛtti and with the Subcommentary or Pañjikā of Kamalashīla*. Kyoto, Japan: Kyoto Sangyu University, 1985.

Shāntideva (*zhi ba lha,* eighth century C.E.)
Engaging in the Bodhisattva Deeds
bodhi[sattva]caryāvatāra
byang chub sems dpa'i spyod pa la 'jug pa
sde dge 3871, dbu ma, vol. *la*
In *bstan 'gyur* (*sde dge*), TBRC W23703.105: 84-578, which is in a PDF of: Delhi, India: Delhi Karmapae choedhey, Gyalwae sungrab partun khang, 1982-1985.
Sanskrit: P. L. Vaidya. *Bodhicaryāvatāra*. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 12. Darbhanga, India: Mithila Institute, 1988.
Sanskrit and Tibetan: Vidhushekara Bhattacharya. *Bodhicaryāvatāra*. Bibliotheca Indica, 280. Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1960.
Sanskrit and Tibetan with Hindi translation: Rāmaśaṃkara Tripāthī, ed. *Bodhicaryāvatāra*. Bauddha-Himālaya-Granthamālā, 8. Leh, Ladākh: Central Institute of Buddhist Studies, 1989.
English translations:
Stephen Batchelor. *A Guide to the Bodhisattva's Way of Life*. Dharmsala, India: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1979.
Marion Matics. *Entering the Path of Enlightenment*. New York: Macmillan, 1970.
Kate Crosby and Andrew Skilton. *The Bodhicaryāvatāra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
Padmakara Translation Group. *The Way of the Bodhisattva*. Boston: Shambhala, 1997.
Vesna A. Wallace and B. Alan Wallace. *A Guide to the Bodhisattva Way of Life*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 1997.
Contemporary commentary:
H.H. the Dalai Lama, Tenzin Gyatso. *Transcendent Wisdom*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 1988.
H.H. the Dalai Lama, Tenzin Gyatso. *A Flash of Lightning in the Dark of the Night*. Boston: Shambhala, 1994.

Tsong-kha-pa Lo-sang-drag-pa (*tsong kha pa blo bzang grags pa,* 1357-1419)

Explanation of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'": Illumination of the Thought
dbu ma la 'jug pa rgya cher bshad pa dgongs pa rab gsal
Karnataka, India: Drepung Loseling Library Society, 1992.
Peking 6143, vol. 154. Also: Dharmsala, India: Tibetan Cultural Printing Press, n.d. Also: Sarnath, India: Pleasure of Elegant Sayings Press, 1973. Also: Delhi: Ngawang Gelek, 1975. Also: Delhi: Guru Deva, 1979.
English translation (chaps. 1-5): Jeffrey Hopkins. *Compassion in Tibetan Buddhism,* 93-230. Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 1980; the portion of the book that is Tsong-kha-pa's *Illumination of the Thought* (chapters 1-5) is downloadable at: http://uma-tibet.org/edu/gomang/dbu_ma/middle.php.
English translation (chap. 6, stanzas 1-7): Jeffrey Hopkins and Anne C. Klein. *Path to the Middle: Madhyamaka Philosophy in Tibet: The Oral Scholarship of Kensur Yeshay Tupden,* by Anne C. Klein, 147-183, 252-271. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1994.
Explanation of (Nāgārjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle": Ocean of Reasoning / Great Commentary on (Nāgārjuna's) "Treatise on the Middle"
dbu ma rtsa ba'i tshig gi le'ur byas pa shes rab ces bya ba'i rnam bshad rigs pa'i rgya mtsho
In *The Collected Works (gsung 'bum) of rJe Tsong-kha-pa Blo-bzang-grags-pa: Reproduced from an example of the old Bkra-sis-lhun-po redaction from the library of Klu 'Khyil monastery of Ladhakh*. New Delhi, India: Ngawang Gelek Demo, 1975.
English Translation: Geshe Ngawang Samten and Jay L. Garfield. *Ocean of Reasoning: A Great Commentary on Nāgārjuna's Mūlamadhyamakakārikā.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
English translation (chap. 2): Jeffrey Hopkins. *Ocean of Reasoning*. Dharmsala, India: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, 1974.
Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path / Stages of the Path to Enlightenment Thoroughly Teaching All the Stages of Practice of the Three Types of Beings
lam rim chen mo / skyes bu gsum gyi nyams su blang ba'i rim pa thams cad tshang bar ston pa'i byang chub lam gyi rim pa
In *gsung 'bum/ tsong kha pa* (*bkras lhun par rnying / d+ha sar bskyar par brgyab pa/*). TBRC W29193.13: 35-1075, which is a PDF of: Dharamsala, India: sherig parkhang, 1997.
Peking 6001, vol. 152. Also: Dharmsala, India: Tibetan Cultural Printing Press, 1964. Also: Delhi: Ngawang Gelek, 1975. Also: Delhi: Guru Deva, 1979.
Edited Tibetan: Tsultrim Kelsang Khangkar. *The Great Treatise on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment (Lam Rim Chen Mo)*. Japanese and Tibetan Buddhist Culture Series, 6. Kyoto: Tibetan Buddhist Culture Association, 2001.
English translation: Lamrim Chenmo Translation Committee. *The Great Treatise on the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment.* 3 vols. Joshua W.C. Cutler, editor-in-chief, Guy Newland, editor. Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 2000-2004.
English translation: Tsong-kha-pa. *Selections from The Great Exposition of the Stages of the Path to Enlightenment by Tsong-kha-pa Lo-sang-drag-pa: Fulfilling the Prerequisites for Special Insight: Identifying Scripture Requiring Interpretation and Scriptures of Definitive Meaning, the History of Commentary on Nāgārjuna's Thought, and How to Settle the View of Emptiness.* Translated by Elizabeth Napper. Dyke, VA: UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies, 2013: http://uma-tibet.org/edu/gomang/pdflinks.php.
English translation of the part on the excessively broad object of negation: Elizabeth Napper. *Dependent-Arising and Emptiness,* 153-215. London: Wisdom Publications, 1989.
English translation of the part on the excessively narrow object of negation: William Magee. *The Nature of Things: Emptiness and Essence in the Geluk World,* 179-192. Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 1999.
English translation of the parts on calm abiding and special insight: Alex Wayman. *Calming the Mind and Discerning the Real,* 81-431. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978; reprint, New Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 1979.

Treatise Differentiating Interpretable and Definitive Meanings: The Essence of Eloquence
drang ba dang nges pa'i don rnam par phye ba'i bstan bcos legs bshad snying po
Peking 6142, vol. 153.
sku 'bum: sku 'bum byams pa gling Par khang, 2000?.
English translation of the Prologue and Mind-Only section: Jeffrey Hopkins. *Emptiness in the Mind-Only School of Buddhism. Dynamic Responses to Dzong-ka-ba's* The Essence of Eloquence, Volume 1. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
English translation of the entire text: Robert A. F. Thurman. *Tsong Khapa's Speech of Gold in the Essence of True Eloquence,* 185-385. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984.

3. Other Works

Cabezón, José Ignacio. *A Dose of Emptiness: An Annotated Translation of the sTong thun chen mo of mKhas-grub dGe-legs-dpal-bzang*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1992.
Cabezón, José Ignacio and Geshe Lozang Dargyay. *Freedom from Extremes: Gorampa's 'Distinguishing the Views' and the Polemics of Emptiness Studies in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism*. Boston, MA.: Wisdom Publications, 2007.
Hopkins, Jeffrey. *Emptiness in the Autonomy School of Buddhism.* Unpublished manuscript.
———. *Maps of the Profound: Jam-Yang-Shay-Ba's Great Exposition Of Buddhist And Non-Buddhist Views On The Nature Of Reality*. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Publications, 2003.
———. *Tsong-kha-pa's Final Exposition of Wisdom.* Edited by Kevin Vose. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Publication, 2008.
———. *Where Is the Middle? Two Views of Reality in the Middle Way: The Autonomy and Consequence Schools.* Unpublished manuscript.
Lati Rinbochay and Elizabeth Napper. *Mind in Tibetan Buddhism*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 1980.
Lindtner, Christian. "Buddhapālita on Emptiness." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 23, no. 3 (1981):187-217.
Saito, Akira. "A Study of the *Buddhapālita-Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti.*" PhD diss., Australian National University, Australia, 1984.Sørensen, Per K. and Guntram Hazod. *Rulers on the Celestial Plain: Ecclesiastic and Secular Hegemony in Medieval Tibet: A Study of Tshal Gung-thang*. 2 vols. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Denkschriften. Wien, Austria: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007.
Tshul-'khrim-bsKal-bzang. *An Introduction to rJe drung Shes rab dbang po's dGongs pa yang gsal: A Textbook (yig cha) for the Study of Madhyamaka of Byes pa College of Se ra Monastery*. Otani University Collection No. 13957. Kyoto, Japan: Rinsen Book Co., 1992
Tsultrim Kelsaṅ Khaṅkar and Katano Michio, tr. *A Study of Tsong khapa's Mādhyamika Philosophy II: Annotated Japanese translation of the Mādhyamika Section of Essence of the Good Explanations (Legs bśad sñiṅ po, ツォンカパ中観哲学の研究II)*. Assisted by Takada Yorihito. Kyoto, Japan: Bun-ei-do, 1998.

Jongbok Yi is Assistant Professor of Asian Philosophy at the Richard Stockton College of New Jersey. He received a B.A. from Sunkyunkwan University in 1997 and received a M.A. from Seoul National University in 2000 in Seoul, South Korea. He studied Indian and Tibetan Buddhism with Professor Emeritus Jeffrey Hopkins and Professor David Germano since 2002 at the University of Virginia and received M.A. in 2005 and Ph.D. in 2013. The title of his dissertation is "Monastic Pedagogy on Emptiness in the Geluk Sect of Tibetan Buddhism: Intellectual History and Analysis of Topics Concerning Ignorance According to Svātantrika-Mādhyamika in Monastic Textbooks by Jam-yang-shay-pa." He has translated several books including *Stages of Meditation* and *Mind of Clear Light: Advice on Living Well and Dying Consciously* by His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama, etc., into Korean. He is currently teaching at the Richard Stockton College of New Jersey since 2013 and is also a translator of the UMA Institute for Tibetan Studies.

The Opposite of Emptiness in the Middle Way Autonomy School

This book provides an analyzed translation of part of Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Decisive Analysis of the Middle,* also called *Great Exposition of the Middle,* which came to be the normative textbook for the study of Chandrakīrti's Middle Way treatise in the Go-mang College of Dre-pung Monastery. Translated here is the section on what is negated in the doctrine of emptiness in general in the Middle Way School and in the Autonomy School in particular. Tsong-kha-pa Lo-sang-drag-pa, the founder of the Ge-lug tradition, emphasized what is rejected in the view of emptiness since without clearly identifying what veils realization of emptiness one cannot achieve liberation.

This book provides the first translation of this section of Jam-yang-shay-pa's *Decisive Analysis of (Chandrakīrti's) "Supplement to (Nāgārjuna's) 'Treatise on the Middle'": Treasury of Scripture and Reasoning, Thoroughly Illuminating the Profound Meaning [of Emptiness], Entrance for the Fortunate,* with Tibetan text interspersed. It is divided into two parts. The initial part:

1. justifies the necessity of identifying the object of negation
2. introduces the two different ways of discerning the two types of objects of negation
3. provides the criteria and subdivisions of the objects to be negated by correct reasonings
4. clarifies easily confused logical terms.

The second part concerns the exaggerated status of phenomena that is negated in the Middle Way Autonomy School. Jam-yang-shay-pa's presentation centers on how Tsong-kha-pa creatively expands on a statement in Kamalashīla's *Illumination of the Middle* so it clearly identifies true existence or ultimate existence in terms of the innate apprehension of true existence as the central object of negation. Tsong-kha-pa does this through finding a supposedly clear exposition in Kamalashīla's text of conventional existence and then drawing out its counterpart, ultimate existence.